The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1919 No. 2801

The Week

THE dispatches from Paris furnish strange reading in connection with the news from Germany during the past few days. On the one hand is Germany, moving with a sort of stumbling accuracy along the path laid out by Russia. Hungry, resentful, divided among themselves, the German working people appear to be tending more and more toward actual Bolshevism; Hugo Haase at the conference of the Independent Socialists of Berlin, has said not only that the Soviet form of government must come in Germany, but that "the principles of Bolshevism cannot be suppressed; they are bound to prevail." The assembly at Weimar is practically isolated; the great strikes appear to be spreading over wider areas; the Government, Russian fashion, talks half resistance, half surrender to the new forces and forms of control. The only German innovation is the unofficial suggestion of making the workers' and soldiers' councils an actual legislative arm of the Government. This would seem to promise little more than the facilitation of a probable transfer of power to the new organs of proletarian control. Meanwhile, order has been forgotten; strikes and counter strikes, riots and shooting, and, more than all, hunger, seem to be the actual ruling forces in Germany. On the other hand is France, victorious and vengeful, intent upon its pound of flesh. The French Government cries for reparation, appearing neither to know nor to care that the Allies are rapidly starving Germany into a state where reparation will mean little more than a joke—a grim Prussian joke. Germany may not buy bread, say France's rulers; it must save its money to pay the bill that the Allies are rapidly itemizing. But when men are beggared and starving, though they may steal or die, they can be counted upon not to pay their debts. France appears willing to risk crippling itself and all of Europe, providing it may have the privilege of crippling Germany, too, while by acquiescing in this behavior the United States and the members of the Entente shoulder their share of the responsibility for what is bound to come. If the bogey of Bolshevism, feared and yet encouraged by the Allies, stalks across Europe in the dangerous guise of famine, part of the blame at least can be laid to the policy which has developed at Paris.

FROM the Rhine to the Yellow River the world is in a state of unrest and revolution. The next step in the German development none can foretell. Russia is a vast experiment station for half a hundred new economic and social undertakings. From the Caucasus and Central Asia we hear reports of violent outbreaks. The Emir of Afganistan has just been murdered. India, which is kept hidden from our curious gaze by the high defensive wall of a strict censorship, suffers from vast strikes, the first evidence of a concerted nationalistic movement, while China is maintaining a perilous balance between Japanese aggression and revolutionary separatism. In a world that is filled with discontent and revolution there is need of wise counsel, a cool head, and a firm hand. The panic of our newspapers and legislative bodies is the worst possible bulwark against the spread of revolutionary doctrines and tendencies. Reason may get the better of popular anger, but hysteria and machine guns only serve to reinforce it.

IN every part of the world the forces of commercial greed are on the *qui vive* to snatch all they can out of the present riot of nationalistic selfishness and hatred turned loose by the war. An inconspicuous item in the recent news apprises us of the fact that the business men of Jamaica are trying to obtain trade preference at the hands of Great Britain. The detail is insignificant, but the principle is one of capital importance. For a generation the self-governing protectionist Dominions of the British Empire have sought some sort of preferential arrangements in the British market; Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa meantime have given a more or less backhanded preference to British goods by penalizing foreign products more heavily than those of the mother country. Great Britain, however, has stood firm against their blandishments, despite Mr. Chamberlain's tariff-reform campaign following the Boer War. In view of the present disturbed industrial conditions in Britain, another strong effort will undoubtedly be made to divert the thought and purpose of the British worker by dangling before him the bait of protection, imperial preference, and empire-wide commercial solidarity. Hitherto he has not grasped at these apples of Sodom, and for the sake of world peace it is to be hoped that he will not do so. The new light that has been dawning on British labor perhaps gives reasonable grounds for hopefulness, despite the strength of the forces of darkness.

IN the report of the great British labor conference last week there were a few clear intimations of what the organized workers of England really have in mind as an economic basis of reconstruction. Some statements slipped over the cables that have never before found their way into print on this side. No longer, said Mr. Clynes, are the workers "prepared to content themselves with every wage advance being thrust upon the consumer and consequently cancelling every improvement instantly and automatically." Here is economic wisdom, a sense of the difference between real and apparent wages, which we have pleasure in bringing to the notice of American trade unionists. They will remember that Mr. Henry Ford's great wage-raise was within fourteen days capitalized by the landholding interests of Detroit for five years ahead. Another indication of the sound training in economics that British labor has gotten, comes out in Mr. Barnes's reference to the profits tax. It has not, said Mr. Barnes, "mitigated the effect of profiteering in the slightest degree, the only use being to make the profiteers agents of the Treasury and to pass on the burden of paying for the war from the shoulders of the rich to the general body of the community." We commend the consideration of the income and inheritance taxes and of all taxes upon industry, to the American laborer in the light of this discovery.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARCHBISHOP PATRICK J. HAYES, lately appointed to succeed Cardinal Farley as head of the Archdiocese of New York, is one of the four men who formulated the striking programme of social reconstruction that has recently been made public by the National Catholic War Council, and, as spiritual leader of 1,325,000 Catholics, he will play an important part in its further development. Without piety of mysticism, and with remarkable tough-mindedness, the War Council has recognized the industrial struggle as the most serious menace to the future peace of every nation. As immediate remedies, it advocates a national system of labor exchanges; the retention of the National War Labor Board; no lowering of the wages attained during the war, "even when the cost of living recedes," for, says the pamphlet, "after all, a living wage is not necessarily a full measure of justice"; the legal minimum wage; recognition of the right of labor to organize for collective bargaining; adequate housing; the establishment of coöperative stores; vocational training; abolition of child labor; heavy taxation of incomes, excess profits, and inheritances; and prevention of monopolistic control of commodities. In its more fundamental suggestions, the programme approaches syndicalism, rather than socialism —the abolition of the wage system, though not the abolition of private ownership. "Full possibilities of increased production will not be realized so long as the majority of the workers remain mere wage-earners. The majority must somehow become owners, or at least in part, of the instruments of production." The capitalist, in the meantime, "needs to learn the long forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship . . . that the laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the laborer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry." "This," concludes this remarkable programme, "is the human and Christian, in contrast to the purely commercial and pagan, ethics of industry."

THE most recent, responsible, and alarming warning concerning the situation that confronts the public schools of this country because of the inadequate wages of teachers has been sounded by P. P. Claxton, commissioner of education. Because of the increase in the cost of living, says Mr. Claxton, salaries on the whole average forty per cent. less in value than a few years ago. Only increases in the next few years which would bring the average salary up to $1,500 a year can prevent the school system of the country from suffering severe deterioration, he declares. "Teachers are now paid less for their work than any other class of workers." "Many of the better teachers are leaving the schools, and their places are taken by men and women of less native ability, less education and culture, and less training and experience. Many of the places are not filled at all. As an inevitable result the character of the schools is being lowered just at a time when it ought to be raised to a much higher standard. . . . No person who is fit to take the time and money and opportunity of the children of this great democratic republic for the purpose of fitting them for life, for making a living, and for virtuous citizenship, should be asked to work for less than $1,000 a year in any community or in any State. . . . It is not for the sake of the teachers that this policy is advocated. . . . It is for the sake of the schools, the children, the prosperity of the people, and the strength and safety of the nation."

WHILE Paris and Berlin, up to the outbreak of hostilities, had been for generations enjoying two or more opera companies, it has usually been held that London and New York would not support more than one at a time. Oscar Hammerstein showed, nearly a decade ago, that there is room for a second company in New York, provided it cultivates a special repertory and offers good singers. The Chicago Opera Company, which is managed by Hammerstein's conductor, Cleofonte Campanini, and still includes some of his singers—notably Mary Garden—has taught the same lesson during its five weeks' season in this city, which ended last Saturday. While there were some off nights, when the operas chosen, or the casts, did not make a strong appeal, most of the performances were well attended. At the same time it is worth noting that apparently the size of the Metropolitan's audiences was not diminished by this rivalry. The Chicago company boasts what no other opera company in the world can now claim: two conductors of the very first rank, Campanini and Polacco; and the conductor counts for more than is generally supposed. Of the singers of eminence and merit besides Mary Garden, we may name Galli-Curci; the Japanese prima donna, Tamaki Miura; and two American girls of unusual promise: Florence Macbeth and Myrna Sharlow. The quest for tenors has resulted in the discovery of Alessandro Dolci, who may develop into a Caruso. Bakhlanoff and Stracciari are two other sterling operatic artists. M. Campanini achieved the stupendous feat of giving twenty-seven operas in thirty days. Fourteen of the operas sung were French, the other thirteen Italian. Of the novelties produced, Massenet's "Cléopâtre" was the most successful and important. Financially the Chicago venture prospered much better than last year.

AMERICAN scholarship in these days exhibits too few minds of the type of Frederic Schenck, tutor in history at Harvard University, who was cut down by pneumonia on February 28, at the age of thirty-two. His inquisitive spirit and genial satire flew playfully over the whole world of knowledge, and he specialized only in the brilliancy of the spoken word and in the use of the fencing foil. He was one of the American fencers at the Olympic games in Stockholm. After his graduation from Harvard, he was to be found in the debating camps of Oxford, where he took a B. Litt. degree in 1912, and later at Harvard, where by accident and accumulation of general information rather than special effort he received the doctor's degree in history in 1918. Meanwhile Harvard had revived for him the title of tutor in history, in which capacity he could exercise his power to inspire his students around the study fire. His skepticism of the efficiency of the university's English A system, and his conviction that Britishers write better because they think better, created for him the position of Secretary of the Committee on the Use of English by Students. Perhaps Dr. Schenck's most permanent contributions are in quite another sphere, that of translator from Scandinavian literature. He has interpreted Holberg's comedies in a kindred spirit of burlesque which satisfies even the critical Danes, and a few days before he died had completed the English manuscript of a History of Swedish Art, shortly to be published. When the Swedish art critic Osvald Sirén came to America, Dr. Schenck's name was suggested to him as a translator. He called up a colleague and asked if Dr. Schenck knew Swedish. "No," was the reply, "not yet, but you need not worry; that is an unessential detail."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Russian Policy at Last

THE disquieting news comes from Paris that the statesmen there assembled have definitely resolved to crush Bolshevism in Russia by force of arms. This news confirms the worst fears raised by the recent Allied abandonment of the Prinkipo Conference, and by the sheer hypocrisy of the statement issued in justification of that step. The impossible is to be attempted. Ideas are to be fought with machine guns. With the avowed object of stamping out Bolshevism at its source, the thing is to be done which will spread Bolshevism throughout the world. Our negative Russian policy, namely, a determination not to treat under any circumstances with the Soviet Government, has suffered a gradual metamorphosis in the furnace of white-hot political affairs, and now appears in its durable form as a positive policy, dominating the whole situation.

Sergius Sazonoff, the Czar's Foreign Minister in 1914, now Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Denikine Government, and holding also a mandate from the Omsk Government in Siberia, emerges as the leading figure in that group of diplomats who represent in Paris the anti-Bolshevist Russian factions. More and more, according to authentic report, he is the man to whom the Allies are looking and with whom they are dealing for the development of that policy which ostensibly is designed to "save Russia," but which in reality is calculated to destroy the Soviet authority. Lvov, Tchaikovsky, Bakhmeteff, and even Maklakoff, are hesitating amateurs in comparison with this old-line diplomat who speaks the full language of the Quai d'Orsay and retains no uncomfortable illusions. His is the plan for retrieving the Russian situation which is coming to be the generally accepted policy of the Allied statesmen.

The first tenet of this plan, as already stated, is a firm resolution to crush the Soviet Government in Russia. No more dallying with Prinkipo conferences and such-like compromise measures; they are too likely to play the boomerang. The Soviet authority is to be destroyed if it takes a term of years. Sazonoff sits in the Russian Embassy in Paris and outlines his plan openly to the newspaper men (though they do not send it to us, for some reason). He thinks that with 200,000 troops he can smash the Soviet Government in eighteen months, provided a rigorous economic blockade is meanwhile maintained against Soviet Russia. What sort of troops? British, French, and American, of course. And where will they operate? In the Black Sea region—this is the main feature of the plan. The Archangel venture was bound to be a disaster; we must be wise and practical this time. The Dardanelles are now open, the climate is milder in the Ukraine, and food is more plentiful; we must work up toward Moscow from the Black Sea as a base, consolidating the country as we go.

From a military point of view it seems like a sound plan, except that it will need 2,000,000 troops instead of 200,000. But from a political point of view, it is incredible that the diplomats of the Quai d'Orsay can still harbor such a notion. Yet the news is that they actually do harbor it. If they cannot read the signs in the sky, have they forgotten the march of Napoleon? If they cannot comprehend the daily and hourly events in England, France, Italy, and Germany, have they not yet discovered that the intervention of last August in Russia only strengthened the Soviet authority?

France in a Hurry

FRENCH labor, whose discontent has been so successfully concealed by the ardent Paris censorship, is answerable for a measure of the haste with which the peace delegates are pressing to a multitude of unstudied conclusions. German events have awakened many reverberations in French cities; in fact, while the Spartacan revolt was at its height it was feared that its triumph might instigate a similar movement in Paris. The collapse of the Liebknecht revolt temporarily heartened the Parliamentary régime in France, but there was renewed fright when the Socialists and Democrats swept the German elections, and the French press was forbidden to report the subsequent British strikes. The one-minute strike on the Paris, Lyons, and Mediterranean railway was a laconic remark by French workers to which the peace delegates have paid anxious heed.

There is nothing novel in the testy temper of French labor or the jumpy reflexes of the Government. Underneath the skilful pretence of unity, France is as eruptive as Italy or Great Britain. It is possibly more so, because of the stringent domination the Government has managed to impose. Early in the war the normal channel of labor expression was closed by the Government's capture of the *Confédération Générale du Travail*, but this did not mean the capture of all French working men. A decentralization ensued, which has given rise to many spontaneous and apparently unrelated disturbances at various times. The most serious moment was in June, 1917, when from a trivial rebellion of a few dressmakers' assistants there grew a strike of 100,000 Paris workers, with mutinies on the front.

For two years the estrangement between the French public and the Government has increased. Military and political mistakes were not candidly confessed, the Parliament took to secret sessions, the censorship kept bad news out of print, and the shortage of paper was used as a pretext to limit the Paris journals to mere bulletins, and to wipe out of existence many provincial periodicals. The eight million landholders in France, normally cautious in viewpoint, have not minded their civic servility so seriously as have the workers, but the situation has been highly unstable, and government in Paris has become a question of the most effective methods of repression rather than of administration. M. Clemenceau's task as Premier was to keep intact, through an uncompromising use of power, the semblance of a united country. The pleasant explanation of the defeatist movement, that it was only a trifling response to the bribery of a Turkish envoy, was evolved for foreign credulity. The truth is that France was almost on the verge of collapse when American troops landed.

There is an incalculable force in French labor which even the French Government is unable to estimate. The Unified Socialists, Thomas and Renaudel, are leaders only in name, while the more radical Jean Longuet has given little evidence of constructive statesmanship. During the war the party Socialists did not conduct or foster strikes, but strove patriotically to suppress them. Now that the war is over, the day of a negative captaincy is ended and the Government may pay dearly for its trick of decentralization by having to deal with a bewildered, undisciplined, and angry proletariat. M. Clemenceau's campaign to keep the world from learning what France is like, and to keep France from learning what the world is about, is almost finished.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poisoning the Wells

OF all the forms of Government propaganda developed by the war, none is more subtly pernicious than the prostitution of educational systems to the selfish purposes of rulers. As we write, there lies before us "A Syllabus of the World War for Use in the High Schools of the City of New York," adopted by the Board of Superintendents. We read that "the American army of the future, both men and women, are in our schools to-day," and that "history should be taught so that a deep emotional appeal shall be made in all topics." Turning the page, we read the Roll of Honor of the Allies, as of July 4, 1918, in the order of their entrance into the war, from Servia to Costa Rica—but with Russia and Rumania conspicuously omitted! Correct enough technically, no doubt, but where stands the Board of Superintendents of New York before the judgment-seat of simple truth? The responsibility for the war we find resting "upon the shoulders of the German Emperor, his political and military leaders, and the German people"—a judgment confirmed by quoting from "a well-known German writer": "Not as weak-willed blunderers have we undertaken the fearful risk of this war. WE WANTED IT." Thus we go on through sixty pages of systematic abuse, to say nothing of downright misrepresentation, of Germany and the German people—and incidentally we get a view of the great war which is no less than a monstrous falsehood.

We read that "in Russia, a revolt broke out against the pro-German court and the Czar . . . Kerensky tried to establish a stable Government but failed on account of the opposition of the extremists, Lenine and Trotzky. When these men attained power, they betrayed their country into the hands of Germany." Again: "In the first American offensive, the famous St. Mihiel salient, which had been held by the Germans for four years, was cleared of the enemy in twenty-seven hours." True enough, yet is it the truth?

We turn from this pamphlet to "Little Lessons in Thrift," prepared for use in schools by Macy Campbell, of the Iowa State Teachers College, and read:

> Bolsheviki means "Those who want more." . . . Bolsheviki means DIVIDE. . . . It means kill and destroy if those who have earned and saved refuse to have their property divided. Discuss in the light of Franklin's sayings given below: 1. The Bolsheviki doctrine of DESTRUCTION vs. the American doctrine of PRODUCE ALL YOU CAN. 2. The Bolsheviki doctrine, LIVE RIOTOUSLY ON THE SAVINGS FORCIBLY TAKEN FROM OTHERS vs. the American doctrine, EARN AND SAVE ALL YOU CAN. 3. The Bolsheviki doctrine that ALL GOVERNMENTS ARE ENEMIES OF WORKING PEOPLE vs. the American doctrine, INVEST ALL YOU CAN IN THE SECURITIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND BECOME A STOCKHOLDER IN THE BEST GOVERNMENT IN THE WORLD.

Admirable lessons these to imprint on the minds of children. Against such falsehoods we might perhaps expect a clear and courageous protest from the universities, had we not watched them for four years. We will not quote any of the thousands of unbalanced, unscholarly, and morally pernicious utterances that have issued from the seats of learning during that time, but as an example of the lamentable cowardice that has deprived them of all claim to moral leadership in the present crisis, we give a single sentence from an appeal recently sent out by the alumni of that university one of whose proudest boasts for many years was the maintenance of the Kaiser Wilhelm and Theodore Roosevelt exchange professorships: "The university has exchanged instruction with scholars from Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and other countries." Such is our loyalty to exact truth, such is the quality of those to whom we should look as guardians of the truth.

Our children in the schools, our young people in the colleges and universities, are still being subjected to a propaganda of falsehood and suppression, sometimes deliberate and calculated, sometimes only cowardly and evasive, but in any case of a character to produce hatred and contempt, and now clearly in process of being turned from our late enemies to the new disturbers of our peace and quiet, the radical thinkers and "Bolsheviki" of every country. In what spirit would our pedagogues have the children receive this message? From the New York pamphlet we quote: "The frequent modification of the policies of our Government to meet new situations makes it inadvisable to publish at this time a syllabus on the topic." Naturally; the Government might change its mind or its policy, and then our syllabus might not be the faithful mouthpiece of our masters. None the less we find it quite possible in the existing syllabus to publish for the children of New York a full-page outline of the arguments for universal military service, declaring it a just duty, a benefit to the individual, non-militaristic, democratic, and of course a preventive of war. Consistency is the vice of little minds, and evidently they were not little minds that framed this pamphlet.

We give one additional instance suggesting the spirit that is apparently desired. The Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association on February 28 in Chicago discussed "Training Pupils for Citizenship" under the following heads: (1) How to teach pupils that democracy involves duties as well as rights. (2) How to teach pupils respect for properly constituted authority. (3) How to teach pupils to respect the rights of others. (4) How to teach pupils faithfulness in the discharge of responsibility. A subservient citizenry, well drilled in falsehoods and hatreds, and trained to the duty of universal military service—what could be a finer or more fitting fruit of a war fought for democracy?

If such is to be the outcome, there is no need to ask who has won the war; for we shall have turned over our children, bound in spiritual chains, to the very enemy against whom our conflict was ostensibly waged. Shall these things be? Once the teachers themselves, and the public that supports the teachers, thoroughly appreciate the situation, once they realize the incalculable injury that is being done to millions of innocent and impressionable children, even the passions of war must yield to the universal human instinct to protect the young. For on that day it will be realized that for the maiming and the slaughter, for the destruction of the means of life, for the ravaging of millions of homes and the snuffing out of all that made the life of tens of millions of human beings worth living—for these things, indeed, those responsible may perhaps find forgiveness at the judgment seat of a merciful God; but for the searing of the souls of little children with the blasting flame of hatred, for the closing of their minds against unwelcome truth, for the poisoning of their spirit with falsehoods concerning their future neighbors, whose only offence is that they are the children of fathers on whom we made war—for these sins against the Holy Spirit those who are to blame shall find no forgiveness though they seek with strong crying and tears.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deadweight Tonnage

THE Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill carries the tidy sum of six hundred and sixty millions for additional ship construction under the Shipping Board. The Board—that is to say, the Government—at present owns nearly half the ocean-going tonnage of the United States, and when all the ships now contracted for shall have been delivered it will own about three-quarters of everything afloat under the American flag, of five hundred gross tons or over. The Government, in other words, will own a merchant fleet of fourteen and a half million tons when its programme is completed in 1920; and it has at present no authority to put this fleet into trade or indeed to do anything with it. Congress has no policy, and apparently no interest in providing one. Senator Ransdell's able speech the other day was delivered to a somnolent baker's dozen of his associates. The meteoric Mr. Hurley says he has a plan in brew which he will communicate to Congress in the course of three or four weeks, but that no one shall know his views until he has presented his proposal. Meantime Congress expires.

So criticism must get on for the time being, we presume, by the light of nature. Several plans have been suggested, running all the way from outright Government ownership and operation, down through various leasing systems to outright private ownership. One of our chief difficulties with the first idea, as with Socialism generally, is its absolutism. To us, Government ownership or operation is in general a proposition strictly *secundum quid;* so much depends—everything, we should say, depends—on the kind of Government that does the owning and operating. Under a purely representative and administrative Government, the proposition appears debatable and we should be glad to discuss it. But under a strictly delegated and political Government such as ours is and bids fair for a long time to remain, it seems to us utterly impracticable and impossible. The same *a priori* objection holds also in the present instance against all the plans of leasing wherein the Government appears as a factor. Aside from this, however, the appearance of the Government at this time as a competitor in ocean freights would be highly dangerous; for the Government would compete not only with private firms here but with private firms abroad, and the difficulty between the Shipping Board and the British Admiralty over the proposed purchase of the fleet of the International Mercantile Marine shows clearly enough the course of diplomatic consequences that might be expected to ensue if the Government took a hand in competition. And further there would be an inevitable, annoying, and costly disturbance of our normal domestic processes of production and distribution. We have seen what governmental interference in various directions already has amounted to, nor are we by any means through seeing or through paying. If the Government failed in the ocean-carrying trade, as ten thousand to one it would fail, the taxpayers would have to bear the loss; if, on the other hand, the Government undercut its private competitors, there would be a considerable disturbance of trade with probably an inadequate shipping service and with danger to the position of labor. The tenure of the Seaman's Act is insecure enough as it is, and should not be put to the chance of further slackening except upon more urgent cause than now appears.

The most immediate objection, however, to Government operation, or to any leasing system based on Government ownership, is that the present is not the time for so radical and elaborate an experiment. If the chances of competent management by Government officials were a hundred times better than they are, if the chances of embroilment with competing foreign interests and friction with domestic interests were a hundred fold more remote than they are, the American people can not at this crisis take the risks of permitting the Government—any Government, let alone such a Government as we now have or are by any means likely to get—to enter the field of ocean-carrying competition. The difficulties of reconstruction are great enough and exacting enough as they are; the way of transition from war to peace is hard enough as it is. There is no use in a gratuitous addition to our perplexities and uncertainties. Our Socialist friends, especially those who expect to see Socialism brought in "increment by increment," are apt to insist that the shipping situation presents a first-rate chance for a long step in the direction of a new social order. But the step is too long to be attempted at this time, and we hope the Socialists will have too much respect for the future of their own programme to be exorbitant about it. Artemus Ward said that on a certain occasion he tried to do too much and did it; and we are convinced that if the Government takes the present as a favorable time to cut a figure as ship owner in the ocean-carrying trade, it will precisely repeat that experience.

Trade and industry are suffering all the serious dislocations that are inevitably incident to the period of transition. Unofficial trade reports show a falling-off of 23,000,000 tons from the month preceding, in the February production of bituminous coal, the closing down of 426 blast furnaces in one district, and the almost complete cessation of industry in another. The cotton-growers propose to plant one-half last year's acreage, or less if necessary, to keep up the price. Great Britain and France are maintaining embargoes against our goods. Italy is not buying, the Central Empires and Russia are closed to us by the iniquitous blockades; and what a nation's business depends on, after all, is orders. And even if we could get orders, we doubt whether there is a manufacturer in the country who can forecast the course of prices well enough to have the slightest idea of where he stands, for instance, on contracts for six months' delivery. General industry is going on half steam, going chiefly by faith and hope, ready to thank its stars if in the end it be not thrown on charity. The general market, the public at large, is waiting for prices to come down. The attitude of each demoralizes the other; and one of the most reassuring things that could happen under these circumstances, is for the Government to cease unnecessary meddling with commerce and industry; and by far the most eligible point of departure is the shipping business.

In the premises, we repeat, of a choice between the opportunism and empiricism of such state control of shipping as this country could by any conjuration set up, and a return to the pre-war principles of private ownership and operation, we speak for the latter. Let the ships be sold under the hammer to the highest bidder in an open market. There would be loss, unquestionably; the ships would no doubt be closed out at prices very advantageous to the buyers, as is usually the case at any forced sale.

But what is the practicable alternative? If the Government keeps the ships, or in any way keeps a hand upon them, there would be far greater loss in the long run. We are not to be understood as absolutely advocating a return to the old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system of private control any more than we would advocate absolutely a policy of Government ownership. We merely plead that the influence of circumstances be given due regard; absolutism, in fact, is the one thing we think above all others generally to be avoided. In the particular case of shipping, we recommend a return to the old system as a *pis-aller*, saying simply that the best it could do, as well as the worst, is quite well known. It could be measured and reckoned with. But nothing can be known about so large and novel a venture in Government enterprise as is contemplated by those who see in the shipping situation an exceptional opportunity to set about a radical transformation of our industrial life. Not only do we fail to see any dependable certainty in its favor, but every reasonable expectation and forecast seems to us against such a venture being undertaken at this time.

A More Excellent Way

THE London *Nation*, after remarking that if the league of nations be permitted to take the form proposed by President Wilson, it were better for the world that it had never been conceived, calls on the forces of liberalism for a "concerted and vigorous endeavor to rescue the idea of the league of nations from death." But the idea was never livelier, the hope of its realization never clearer. All one has to do is to release one's eyes from fixation upon any conclave of politicians—and we have never permitted our own to rest there with even momentary hopefulness—and raise them to contemplation of the great essential movement of human society, of which politics ever furnishes only a tardy and reluctant registration, and one will be forthwith reassured. A league of nations may well be hard at hand; for the agencies promoting it are at work with a freedom and vigor never known before; and it will be a league founded upon enlightened understanding of the natural laws that govern society and not upon the resultant of political trades and deals.

The essential condition of a league of nations is primarily freedom. Every other expedient for the maintenance of international peace and harmony has been tried and has failed. Freedom alone has never been tried; but if we understand the signs of the times, it is likely to be the next great social experiment. We mean, first, freedom of economic opportunity, by restoring natural resources to open competition with industry in the labor market, by breaking up monopolistic control of credit and industrial power, and by working out a democratic organization within industry itself. Society now seems well permeated with the sense that this is the basic measure of emancipation. Russia has actually nationalized the land; so have Mexico and Austria. The great body of British labor has declared for similar measures; so have several important organizations in the United States, notably the Nonpartisan League, the Socialists, and the new independent labor movement. The North Dakota farmer legislature has provided a credit system intended to meet effectively the needs of the great body of North Dakota's producers, and has taken far-reaching steps to correct the marketing abuses of which they complain. The shop stewards in Great Britain are pointing their comrades to methods of organized democratic freedom within a highly developed industry. The world seems to be striving toward freedom of economic opportunity. We mean, second, freedom of trade; not in the old sense of the Manchester school or the Cobden Club, but as correlated with freedom of economic opportunity and inseparable from it. With these established, the rise of a league of nations would be automatic, and the perpetration of a war would be inconceivable.

So Senator Borah might have replied overwhelmingly to Mr. Taft's challenge the other day. The trouble is, however, that economic freedom would also automatically attenuate political government. It would break up the stratification of society which now exists between an income-receiving exploiting class and a propertyless laboring class; and as Continental economists have for a generation been pointing out, it is the primary function of political government to maintain this stratification. So in issuing his challenge, Mr. Taft was quite sure of his ground. President Wilson's project may be freely—and quite indifferently—accepted as perhaps about as good as can be manufactured short of the one thing needful upon which the world is preparing to insist; but the shocking poverty of his explanations shows how inadequate it is, how fictitious and inept, how unworthy of comparison even with the adumbrations to sound economic doctrine which appeared here and there in his own fourteen points. Whatever the Senate does with it or does not do, the world has already passed it by. We therefore invite the attention of our despondent contemporary, as of all liberals, resolutely away from capitals, Ministries, Parliaments, and conferences, to rest with encouragement upon the indefeasible tendency of peoples. The league of nations is not being born in any Star Chamber while politicians cry, Lo here or Lo there. It is not to be under any circumstances a thing made to order. It will come inevitably, and we hope quickly, by a natural process and as a natural result, out of the irresistible determination of the peoples, everywhere manifest, toward emergence into economic liberty.

An Important Oversight

A PARIS dispatch last week observed that the President's Boston speech seems to have awakened France to the fact that she is better off with the league of nations, "wherein Uncle Sam guarantees her future, than with the old system of European alliances but without America's millions in dollars and men." We do not by any means believe all that we read in the papers, but we have heard intimations like this before; and we should like to know what financial obligations, if any, this country would be implicitly committed to under the new alliance proposed by President Wilson. As far as we know, this aspect of the new treaty has not been discussed. There is nothing nominated in the bond, nothing explicit; but the new relationship may very easily carry implicit financial obligations quite as binding as those of the traditional international marriage. If so, we raise no objections in advance; we merely say that the country is entitled to know at once what they are likely to be.

On January 29, Sir Edward H. Holden, chairman of the London Joint City and Midland Bank, in reporting to his shareholders, gave some interesting estimates of national war debts. He puts Great Britain's total net debt at about thirty-two billion dollars, Germany's at forty-one and one-half billions, and the United States's at thirteen billions; and observes that in view of our wealth and productive capacity and the character of our banking system, our burden would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be light. Curiously, however, Sir Edward offers no estimate for either France or Italy, though the necessary data can hardly be beyond his reach. The omission is striking. Again, we have heard the suggestion from France and Italy—unofficial, to be sure, but unmistakably definite—that all the Allied war-debts should be pooled and prorated according to wealth and population. Again, as "significant of France's newly-warm indorsement of the league of nations," *Le Journal* presents a proposal for a joint pensioning system, to cost $320,000,000, of which the United States would be expected to furnish thirty-six per cent., Great Britain nine per cent., and France and Italy five per cent. each, the remainder to be divided among Japan and the smaller nations. Again, in the dispatches of March 3, France is reported as having filed a demand for some of the German naval ships, thus further confusing the very difficult problem of naval disarmament and possibly entailing upon this country a continuance of its ruinously expensive part in naval armament competition. Again, not long ago, a visiting French dignitary intimated that we should shortly provide a billion dollars for reconstruction work; while another suggested that it would be a nice thing for us to discount some two or three billion dollars of potential indemnity for immediate use in France, and collect it ourselves from Germany afterward as best we could! These recommendations are all very well, possibly open to some little criticism on the ground of taste and courtesy, but nevertheless to be considered on their several merits. They seem to show, however, the distinct possibility of extreme awkwardness and difficulty in the new relationship; a possibility that in our judgment should be anticipated with the most sedulous care. When we became a belligerent it was freely prophesied by many who did not permit their emotions quite to obfuscate their common sense, that the war would end with the United States "holding the bag." It may well be so; in fact as things are at present shaping themselves, it seems more than possible, but if so, the country may at least retrieve a scanty measure of self-respect if it wakes up to the real condition of affairs and resolutely faces its destiny with open eyes.

Two things seem certain: first, that Great Britain is not in a position to help much further those associated nations which may need help—which indeed appear to need it; second, that it is simply preposterous to think of indemnities from Germany which will balance even a beggarly fraction of the Allied war debts. Germany is able to pay very little, though she still has some good resources. But even if she were able to pay much more than she can, she is in the position known to the business world as "judgment-proof." She is in a position to say—and quite obviously has already said—to the extremists on the other side, "Moderation, gentlemen, or Bolshevism; take your choice—and make up your mind promptly." Under these circumstances, the position of the United States is very delicate and difficult; how delicate and difficult there seems to be very little general appreciation, which is singularly unfortunate, since it would be extremely advantageous to know definitely whether the tendency of the new relationship is not to enhance its difficulty. Before the welling flood of sentimentalism over the league of nations cuts off all chance of recourse to a drier world, we trust that proper inquiry into this matter will be instituted without undue delay, which will obviously be to the immense advantage of all parties concerned, but chiefly to that of our own country and people.

Reverence for Law

HAVING lately heard so much about Bolshevism and disrespect for law, we have been trying to give ourselves some sort of answer to the apparently simple question, *What is law?* We did not succeed, but we got a great deal of entertainment out of trying—let the reader try it. Then our mind moved to the associated problem of anarchism. The anarchists we have known do not correspond with the popular notion of the breed, being gentle and kindly persons who abhor and deprecate violence of any kind. Of such, for instance, was Emerson; yet he flatly says that "a good man will not obey the law too strictly"; and again:

> Republics abound in young civilians who believe that the laws make the city . . . that any measure, though it were absurd, may be imposed on a people if only you can get sufficient voices to make it a law. But the wise know . . . that the form of government which prevails is the expression of what cultivation exists in the population which permits it. The law is only a memorandum. We are superstitious and esteem the statute somewhat; so much life as it has in the character of living men is its force.

Our anarchist friends tell us that they are the only really law-abiding people in the world; that above all the statutes which politicians make in their legislatures, there is inherent in the order of nature, like the law of gravitation, a higher law under which men have always lived and must live, whether they know and like it or not. It is the law of moral action and reaction, whereby love breeds love, hate breeds hate, and violence breeds violence. It is invariable and self-executing, and depends neither on courts nor on judges. A statute, our friends say, is a law only when it is drawn in conformity to this inexorable principle laid down by nature for the constitution and conduct of human society. There is probably something in this, but think what havoc it would raise with the Revised Statutes if they were expurgated by the light of this idea. The combined codes of the world would dwindle to a two-page pamphlet, and the occupation of lawyers, judges, and juries would approach indefinitely near the status of a sinecure.

Our immigration statutes are hard on anarchists, almost as unintelligently hard as the Overman Committee. They do not trouble to define an anarchist, but apparently resent him as a monstr'-horrend'-inform'-ingendous refinement and sublimation of the Wild Man of Borneo, who fiercely resists all authority. Yet we have never seen or heard of an anarchist who objected to the authority of an orchestra conductor, a traffic policeman, or a fire chief. We dislike to think that an immigrant Emerson, Whitman, or Paine would be kept out of the country by the operation of these statutes. Right joyfully, indeed, if we had our way, would we trade off our Overmans and Nelsons for all such that any foreign land might furnish, at a ratio of sixteen to one, or, on a close bargain, even better. But the Bar Association might turn on us at this point and demand *our* definition of an anarchist. The question would be a fair one and by no means inurbane; yet we can not take our little lucubrations seriously enough to attempt an answer. As a generalization, however, we may venture the opinion that there is the making of a pretty fair anarchist in any one whose imagination is quickened, and whose sense of humor is touched, by the fact that part of the battlefield of Gettysburg was posted with signs which read, "Shooting on these premises is forbidden under penalty of the law."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Raleigh and Roosevelt

By FREDERICK TUPPER

IT was once said of a timid and diffident scholar-poet, shrinking from the everyday give and take of life, that "he never spoke out." "He always spoke out" may be as truly asserted of the courageous and confident spirit whose voice that yesterday rang like a trumpet in the ears of all the world is now still. Nor was the frequency of Theodore Roosevelt's emphatic utterance in itself more surprising than Thomas Gray's fastidious reticence. Downright men of action, ever ready with both weapon and word, are as often with us as shy bookmen and dreamers, upon whose lips a seal is set. It was not the frequency of Mr. Roosevelt's speech, but its infinite variety—the untrammelled expression of the man's myriad-mindedness—that held us all agape. Much of twentieth-century life and thought seemed to find explosive vent through his tongue and pen. As the oftentimes unchartered freedom of his spoken and written words ran directly counter to the well-worn Victorian canon of "measure," so the full sweep of his never-jaded mind, seldom soaring into the ether, but ranging like his active body far and wide over earthly spaces, disdained the cribbed confinement of present-day singleness of intent and interest. "The spacious times of great Elizabeth" was one of his very rare quotations (he disliked the thraldom of other men's sayings, though he imposed the fetters of his own catchwords upon many willing captives), and it is among the Anakim of those ample days that we must seek his fellows. These far-off statesmen and fighters, men of deeds as well as of dreams, tempering their idealism with a shrewd practicality that judged purpose and plan by the outcome, the event, would have been in hearty accord with the pragmatism of Mr. Roosevelt's criterion of character: "Not what the man can do, but what he actually does!"

Nor is the suggested comparison between past and present untimely, for happily the most shining exemplar of Elizabethan versatility has been much in men's minds and mouths since the tercentenary of his passing a few months ago. And if, at first blush, there seems to be aught unfitting or indecorous in any parallel between Walter Raleigh and Theodore Roosevelt, one has reason for hazarding the surmise that a coupling of the two striking personalities, whose varied exploits filled corresponding years of widely different centuries, would not have been displeasing to the later man. If we disregard differences of time and temper, of which more must be said anon, a general index to the varied rôles of the earliest great American (for so, at least in intent, must we reckon the colonizer of Virginia) will serve as fitly for the last great American to leave us. Patriot, soldier, statesman, champion of preparedness and an adequate navy, explorer, book-lover, ready writer, historian, and student of the sciences—thus far, certainly, you cannot tell one man from the other. Let no one be led, however, into the error of "forgetting the fact that no comparison is implied between two men in the sense of estimating their relative greatness or importance, when the career of each of them is chosen merely to illustrate some given quality that both possess." Mr. Roosevelt himself, writing thus in his pleasing little essay, "Dante and the Bowery," fully sanctions our present practice.

Edmund Gosse very wisely began his stirring address at the Mansion House exercises of last October, which supplemented the memorial services at Raleigh's own resting-place, St. Margaret's, Westminster, with due insistence upon the versatile Elizabethan's patriotic formula: "England shall, by the favor of God, resist, repel, and confound all whatsoever attempts against her sacred kingdom." Enthusiastic devotion to country was also Mr. Roosevelt's ruling passion. In youth both men gave themselves unreservedly to the service of the state, as potent speakers and fighters. The Spanish war-cloud was ever on the watery horizon of late sixteenth-century England, as of late nineteenth-century America, and the "Shepherd of the Ocean" preached early and late the gospel of preparedness and sea-service against Spain as vehemently as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Raleigh's striking plea, "Though the sword be put into the sheath, we must not suffer it there to rust or stick so fast, that we shall not be able to draw it readily, when need requires," is in our inveterate phrase-maker's very manner. But the Englishman's vivid warnings against the Spanish menace of world-dominion find their closest analogue in the American's fervent kindling of his countrymen against the threatening Germany of the Hohenzollerns.

"The Winning of the West" or "Westward Ho!" occupied much of the thought of both men in their younger time. The eighties of their corresponding centuries are the period of Raleigh's four Virginia expeditions and of Roosevelt's four Western volumes. The coloniser, reaching out into the future with the prophetic energy of an heroic mind, never realized his vision splendid, indeed never saw with his own eyes the country of his golden dreams; yet by his idealism he inspired even in his own lifetime the successful ventures of "stern men with empires in their brains." The historian, peering into the past, writes of the Western settlements of far later pioneers with a sympathy born of a long sojourn in the land of his affection among the rough conditions of red-blooded frontier life. The hearts of both turned eagerly to the sunset. At the age of fifty, Raleigh, with boyish hope, finances a last futile voyage to Virginia. Mr. Roosevelt's pen, when it finds any occasion to describe the strong-backed, brown-handed men of the West, who, "under the shadow of world-old forests and in the sunlight of the great lonely plains wrought out the destinies of a nation and a continent," half-consciously adopts the swelling language of early colonial expansion.

As explorers, the two adventurous spirits clasp hands across the centuries. At least once their wandering feet were on like Southern ground. Raleigh seeks a lost city of gold in the forests of Guiana, Roosevelt finds a new river of doubt in the forests of Brazil. In their quests the Englishman and the American both travelled slowly up great solitary streams, lined with tangled banks full of gorgeous tenants. Both are keen observers and ready writers: the later discoverer, viewing all from the vantage-ground of a sympathetic knowledge of natural history, is, of course, the more accurate and trustworthy; the other, aided by the magnificent diction with which he sometimes offsets the wonted simplicity of his English, is the more romantic and picturesque. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor, indeed, any present-day wanderer in far-off places can approach in charm

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the best of those wonderful sketches from Raleigh's notebook of the Orinoco voyage. Of the linked sweetness of that rapturous prose only the Elizabethans knew the secret.

"A Book-lover's Holidays in the Open," one of Mr. Roosevelt's more recent volumes, would have thoroughly delighted Walter Raleigh. He, too, was an outdoor man and a lover of books,—never a more ardent lover of these than when wandering under the wide heaven. The "Pigskin Library," borne in saddle-pocket or in cartridge-bag on African or Brazilian trails and read in the restful noonings of the hunt, recalls the trunk of books which Raleigh, whom old Naunton calls "an indefatigable reader whether by sea or land," carried on his voyages, to divert him during the long hours. All but a few of the Roosevelt volumes are younger than Raleigh's day; but these few are the most precious of the collection—Shakespeare, Marlowe, Spenser, the "Book of Elizabethan Verse," Froissart, Dante, the Greek tragedians, Theocritus, Homer, and the Bible. Raleigh not only presided over the wit-combats of dramatists at the Mermaid Tavern, as Alfred Noyes has pleasantly reminded us, but bandied verses with them; Spenser's patron and companion in Ireland, he was the first to feel the spell of the "Faerie Queene"; he turned the pages of the King James Version, wet from the press; a perfect knight, he knew well his Froissart, recently Englished; a child of the Renaissance, he was steeped in the classics; himself a poet, "full of subtle flame," he must have read Dante not only, like Mr. Roosevelt, for his "veined humanity" and moral uplift, but for his mystical contemplation. The consciousness of power manifest in both men's words and deeds finds accurate expression in Dante's phrase: "Fidandomi di mi piu che di un altro" ("Trusting myself more than anyone else").

Raleigh may have slept only five hours, so as to gain four each day for books, Roosevelt may have eaten the heart out of many volumes, but it was not only by reading that they daily acquired knowledge. So strong was the intellectual curiosity of both that they constantly sought information from every mouth. Raleigh, as a boy, taxed all seafaring men with questions anent their experiences in many parts of the world, rewarding their stories with the rapt wonder that fills the eyes of the child in the Millais painting; as a man he gathered about him in London men of science and letters, who satisfied his ardent desire to know and who requited his patronage in pompous dedications. Mr. Roosevelt, also an eager questioner, gleaning from each chance acquaintance the best of the stranger's harvest, and seeking close personal contact with the men whose books he loved, would have applauded Raleigh's scheme of an "encyclopædic bureau, where students might obtain information on all kinds of subjects at first hand from experts." The world was Roosevelt's encyclopædia, for to him nothing that told of the life about him ever came amiss. Both were devotees of science. Even on shipboard, Raleigh dabbled in chemicals; and, when caged by the beastly James in the Tower, he turned a former hen-house into a laboratory for his experiments, condensing fresh water from salt, and compounding new and effective drugs against various disorders. Mr. Roosevelt's tremendous interest in scientific observation, attested chiefly by his life-long study of natural history, made him a worthy fellow of the early investigator. To seek and to find was the aim of both.

Both Raleigh and Roosevelt were lovers and narrators of history; and both brought to their welcome task no mean qualifications—wide reading and an intimate knowledge of the motives of men. And if it seems an absurdly far cry from the ponderous "History of the World," whose first and only volume begins with Creation, teems with Hebrew patriarchs and heathen pantheons, and ends with the rise of Rome, to chronicles of the American West or of the young Navy, and biographies of our older statesmen, yet much the same methods are followed by both writers. Each strives always to draw from the past fruitful lessons for the present. To Raleigh "the end and scope of all history is to teach by example of times past such wisdom as may guide our desires and actions." To Roosevelt "the eternal problem forever fronting each man and each race, forever shifts its outward shape and yet at the bottom it is always the same," and his great Americans are "types upon which the men of to-day can well afford to model themselves." Each portrays the prominent figures of history, as if they were contemporary persons, inspiring deep affection or violent antipathy. Raleigh, musing in his splendid Preface upon a theme of present interest, the "frightfulness" and merited fall of monarchs—which his folio so fully illustrates—wins the censure of his own king, the cautious James, by asserting of Henry VIII: "If all the pictures and patterns of a merciless prince were lost in the world, they might all again be painted out of the story of this king." The aggressive young Roosevelt shocks the sensitive reviewers of his "Life of Benton" by the frankest of comments upon early Presidents, pronouncing this one "a scholarly, timid and shifty doctrinaire," that one "a small politician of low capacity and mean surroundings," a third "a politician of monumental littleness." Each aims at readableness, and each captures many readers, not so much, I think, by virtue of his themes as by revelation of his own vigorous personality. The story, though well told, thus becomes the least part of itself, for the purpose of each author is, in Raleigh's quaint phrase, "to make my thoughts legible and myself the subject of every opinion wise or weak." And we like best, in their many volumes, the moments of reflection, in which these men moulded by the large experience that breeds not only common-sense but insight into the springs of human action, banish both characters and plot, and themselves take the front of the stage for suggestive monologues on the motives of public conduct in peace and war. Mr. Roosevelt's phrase, "The great historian is a great moralist," seems framed to fit a writer whose history was treasured by the puritans for its spiritual content and is praised by modern critics as "a largehearted sermon."

Through the possession of a dozen common traits each serves as a mirror for the other. "I thank God," exclaimed Raleigh in his last great hour, "that he has sent me to die in the light and not in the darkness." Mr. Roosevelt would have grasped at once the full meaning of that euthanasia, for he too delighted in the sunshine, rather than in the shade, liking as little as the Elizabethan a life of cloistered virtue. If these two impetuous spirits drank more deeply of life than their fellows, travelled farther, fought harder, observed, achieved, and enjoyed more, it was largely because they carried into every phase of their crowded careers a love of adventure both of body and mind and a reverent regard for the ideals of their younger time. Both men delight us by their manly straightforwardness whenever they speak to youth. The wonted style of both is signally simple and direct, with little ornament, and with the occasional loose structure of generous talk, the frank speaking of frank natures. Raleigh and Roosevelt always spoke out.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Street Railway Crisis

By JOHN P. FOX

IS public ownership the solution of the difficulties of the electric railways of the United States? An affirmative answer was given last October by the St. Louis and Milwaukee companies at the annual convention of the electric railways of the country. Since that time, the citizens of Seattle have decided, by a vote of three and a half to one, to purchase the local lines owned by Stone and Webster, for the agreed price of $15,000,000, while Detroit has engaged the city engineer of San Francisco to advise on a similar proposal to be submitted to the electorate this spring. Now, in a notable and illuminating report on the whole subject of urban transportation, the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, after considering every phase of the traction situation, declares that the only practical solution of the difficulties of the companies, and the only way to give the public the service and facilities required at a sufficiently low rate of fare, is some form of State or municipal ownership.

This report points out that fourteen years of experimenting with higher fares in Massachusetts have failed to provide adequate revenue for the companies, and that some other remedy than increased rates must be sought, if the State is to have transit facilities adequate for the prevention of congestion in the cities and for the development of the country districts. The importance of adequate transportation is fully set forth and also the urgent need of better service, more equipment and other improvements, together with fares low enough to encourage the proper use of electric railways.

The financial difficulties of the companies have arisen in part from overbuilding, cheap construction, ill-advised consolidations, and neglect of depreciation; in part from war prices and wages, and automobile competition. To meet the changed conditions, the Commission has in the past permitted the raising of fares all over the State.

No other part of the country has been more liberal in its treatment of the railways, but the result has not been what was hoped. With all their raising of fares, our companies seem little nearer salvation. It has become an accepted principle that the increase in revenue is never in proportion to the increase in rate. Higher fares discourage riding, and what the roads often gain on the one hand, they lose, in part, on the other. The benefit which they receive is clearly less than the burden upon the car rider; and if the process is carried much further, there may be no benefit at all.

The raising of fares results in the discouragement of riding, the consequent diminution of service, the stimulation of jitney competition, and the driving of population back into the cities. Any further raising of fares is accordingly rejected as likely not to accomplish the ends to be attained.

Yet the welfare of the State requires that the railways be placed in condition for first-class service; this result can apparently be accomplished only by assistance from general taxation. But it is extremely doubtful if adequate public financial aid can be afforded to private companies, because of a recently adopted constitutional amendment forbidding the loan of State credit to private interests, leaving practically no alternative except public ownership or management.

It will be agreed that this country has never hesitated to take over enterprises when private initiative could not be relied upon to produce the results demanded by the public interests. Illustrations are the schools, highways, canals, waterways, water supply, drainage, fire prevention, and irrigation. If, then, a similar point has been reached in electric railway transportation, the commonwealth will be following no very novel or radical course if it now turns to public operation. While the management and operation of street railways would involve the exercise of administrative functions more complex in some respects than those of other enterprises which have already passed from private to public control, we have little fear that the changed conditions resulting from the assumption of direct public responsibility for this public service would be cause for more regret than in the cases above cited. No doubt the usual amount of human imperfection would be manifested in the case of public operation, but railway service comes so close home to the people that we venture to predict that they would not long tolerate a dishonest or inefficient public management. But, whatever view may be entertained of the relative merits of private and public operation where conditions permit free choice between the two, the fact that public aid seems to offer the only practicable means of escape from present transportation ills forces us, of necessity, if not from choice, to include public operation as an integral part of any plan that may be devised for the solution of our street railway problems.

The only effective solution for the present difficulties, accordingly, appears to be the outright purchase or taking of the railways by the municipalities or by the State—a proceeding which would permit all the necessary capital to be raised on the credit of the public, and would remove all difficulty as to the adequacy of fares, by permitting the necessary income to be raised partly from taxation, if necessary, also permitting private management if still desired.

The Commission suggests that the companies would undoubtedly be willing to sell on the basis of capital actually invested, but that in the case of most of the roads this would be more than they could reasonably expect, because so many of the companies are apparently unable, under any rates which they may charge, to earn a fair return upon the original investment.

Moreover, in any event, the measure of value in the case of purchase or condemnation of the properties is not necessarily the same as when the value is fixed for rate-making purposes. In the case of ordinary land takings, no one would think of basing compensation upon original investment, and it would be difficult to demonstrate that this should be the rule in the present instance. If the commonwealth should acquire the properties, there seems no good reason for departing from the general rule by paying more than their present worth on reasonable market value.

Massachusetts has always stood for fair treatment of public utilities; it was the first State to permit the charging of higher fares. In return, it has demanded absolute honesty of capitalization on the part of the companies, always allowing a fair return on the actual money invested, without any deduction for depreciation as required in other States. In buying out properties, however, the Commission evidently believes that the public should not be obliged to pay more than the companies have actually made the properties worth. In case they have injured their own business by fixing fares too high, neglecting economies of operation, driving away traffic by poor service, losing money by inadequate methods of fare collection or complicated fares, the Commission evidently feels that the public ought to give the owners only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the price which they could reasonably expect in a fair market for their properties.

As to management, the Commission follows the precedent adopted by the Federal Government in the case of the steam railroads, and recommends a director general of street railways appointed by the Governor, with centralized purchase of supplies and planning for rehabilitation, but with local managers for small operating districts. A five-year term of office and an adequate salary are suggested in order to attract a man of the requisite capacity. This recommendation by the Commission of a single director, in preference to a board of management, is an important suggestion—undoubtedly the result of seven months' unsatisfactory experience with the trustee plan in Boston.

The fixing of rates could be put in the hands of the director general, in accordance with general principles laid down by the Legislature. The rates should be such as would produce the maximum revenue consistent with the free movement of traffic, the prevention of congestion in the city centres, and the proper development of the country districts. As a matter of fact, the five-cent fare was the best revenue getter the electric railways ever had, and the industry never made a greater mistake than when it tried to impose rising costs upon the public through higher fares, instead of meeting them through greater efficiency of operation and increased volume of business, such as has been obtained so strikingly through the use of one-man cars.

It is recommended that the supervision of the Public Service Commission be continued for the present with respect to accounting, service, and accommodations, in order to relieve the director general of long hearings, to provide an independent arbiter of disputes, to assist the Governor in judging the results of management, and to prevent the creeping in of any abuses. Additions and betterments could be met by the issuance of State bonds, while extraordinary renewals, necessitated by past neglect, could with justification be spread over a period of years, by issuing serial bonds payable in annual instalments. The cost of service would be met in part by the car-rider, in part, unless conditions radically changed, by the community as a whole, being levied upon the cities and towns served by the railways in proportion to trackage or population, provided for by special forms of taxation, or raised by increased taxes on real estate. The exact cost of the plan the Commission is unable to predict in advance, but it points out several factors which are decidedly favorable to keeping down the cost.

The Commission views with considerable optimism the future of the railways, if they are placed under public ownership, with their credit restored and an adequate supply of capital insured. Special emphasis is laid on the possibilities of light one-man cars, which are having such an influence on the electric railway industry. Equipped with automatic safety devices, easy to handle, started and stopped as quickly as an automobile, and popular with the public, these cars are said to be of even greater advantage in city districts than on country lines of lean traffic, for they can be used to provide much more frequent service without increase in expense, and frequency of service is the thing which attracts traffic in short-haul urban territory. Successful in the South, the West, and Canada, they represent a valuable labor-saving, power-saving, track-saving device.

It would have been possible to go much farther in this connection, and point out that the one-man car has caused a revolution in the electric railway industry second only in importance, perhaps, to the introduction of electricity itself. It has cut in half the cost, not only of platform labor, but of the cars themselves, and of track maintenance and power as well, at the same time reducing accident and other expense. This extraordinary saving in costs, when applied in part to giving more service at higher speeds, has increased revenues on some lines as much as sixty per cent., proving a veritable gold mine to the companies that have been progressive enough to adopt the idea. If the companies generally had taken up the one-man car in time, it is possible that they could have saved themselves almost all their existing financial difficulties. As the Commission points out, the public can take advantage of this remarkable development to improve upon the record of private management.

Another idea for increasing the economy of operation is the lowering of the "peak loads" of traffic at the morning and evening rush periods by "staggering" the hours at which business houses open and close, instead of having them begin and end their day at much the same time, thus clogging the arteries of traffic with sudden tides of humanity. It is the idea of the Commission that this reform will be more easily tried under public management. It urges further:

> A unified public management with an adequate supply of capital would also make it possible to improve power, shop, and track conditions which are admittedly adding to the cost of operation on many of our railways. . . . Unified management, furthermore, should make it feasible to bring about a standardization of equipment and supplies like that which so many industries in this country have found of great advantage. It is such standardization which has made it possible to produce Ford automobiles at low cost, and still pay high wages. If the rails and cars and other items which street railways use could be manufactured in a similar manner, without doubt their cost would be substantially reduced.

On account of the far-reaching consequences of the proposed new policy, the Commission believes that comprehensive legislation should not be undertaken until there is sound reason to believe that the plan will be in accord with public opinion and will receive the whole-hearted support of the community. It should be approved in final form by a referendum vote, so that the people of the State will be behind the new policy, and will become directly responsible for its success. In urging such approval, it says:

> It is really a question of alternatives. If some such plan is not adopted, the alternative is to continue the present policy and attempt to cure street railway ills by the raising of fares. It is not impossible that, as the public becomes inured to this policy, it may produce better financial results than have yet been realized. Even if this proves to be the case, however, it will be a long time before the credit of the companies is good, and the higher fares, in our judgment, are certain to lessen the value of the railways to the State, and to cause a gradual shifting of population which will be harmful in its results. On the other hand, if increased rates do not improve financial conditions, a period of receiverships and reorganizations will result, which may finally lead to better conditions, but only at the cost of abandoned lines and still worse service meanwhile. The people must choose between these alternatives. If they are to have good service, undoubtedly they must pay for it, in one form or another. Public ownership will at once insure a much needed supply of capital and make lower fares feasible, and we know of no other way of accomplishing these results, other than a permanent guarantee of the outstanding securities of the companies, which would be open to the objections already pointed out. Nor do we think that public management is greatly to be feared. Whether there are other disadvantages which will outweigh the benefits received, we are not prepared to say.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New United States

III. As Memphis Sees the Future

MEMPHIS has a distinct advantage in its geographical situation. Unlike Birmingham, for example, its opportunities for commercial and industrial development are not restricted either by certain untractable but compelling physical conditions or by the course which the future exploitation of a predominant natural resource may take. It is one of the world's great cotton centres, and it is also the world's largest hardwood lumber market; but it is not irrevocably tied to either. The steady development of farming interests in addition to cotton growing, in the surrounding region, joined to the absence of large competing cities nearby, makes it an important jobbing centre and opens up possibilities of wealth through general trade. Moreover, while Memphis has many railways, the Mississippi is also there for the profit of whoever has vision enough to utilize it for a commercial highway.

Memphis is one of the cities, more numerous in the South and the central West than in the North and East, the normal course of whose economic development has been neither deflected nor distracted by the war. As go cotton and hardwood, so goes Memphis, as a whole if not in every detail; and the future of these two basic industries is being scanned with unusual attention. A systematic effort is being made to reduce the cotton acreage of the present year. An advertising campaign, organized and conducted by Theodore V. Wensel of Natchez, Miss., "at the suggestion and with the moral and financial support of the leading cotton factors of New Orleans, Memphis, Savannah, Galveston, Houston, Dallas, and bankers, merchants, and cotton men throughout the South," is appealing to the planters to "cut your cotton acreage one-third," and "hold your cotton until the spinners ask for it." "They will ask for it soon," one advertisement continues,

> because all export restrictions are being removed; ocean freight rates are cut; neutral countries will now be allowed to buy freely; peace will soon be declared and Germany and Austria will then be allowed to buy cotton. Your 1918 cotton should not be sold for less than thirty cents a pound basis middling and should bring that or more if held.

The same advertisement calls attention to the fact that while the 16,000,000-bale crop of 1911-12 brought the Southern planters only $810,000,000, the 11,900,000-bale crop of 1917-18 brought a total of $1,667,000,000. On the basis of these figures, the farmers are urged to hold down the cotton crop of 1919 to 9,000,000 bales, and to plant more feedstuffs and foodstuffs. Prominence has also been given in the press to the conference of Senators and Representatives from the cotton-growing States, held at Washington on February 6, in which the action of cotton dealers and speculators in attempting to beat down the price was severely criticised by Representative Heflin of Alabama, and the removal of all restrictions upon the export of cotton was urged. Efforts are also being made to induce the bankers to aid the movement by withholding or discouraging loans to cotton planters whose acreage is not substantially reduced.

In spite of the assurance of the advertising pronouncements, comparatively few business men at Memphis appear to take much interest in the movement or regard it as practical. It was pointed out that export restrictions were already being lightened, and would probably be removed altogether as soon as ample tonnage was available; that ocean freight rates had recently been heavily cut; that the demand for cotton in all parts of the world was likely to be large during the next few years, when the industries of so many countries were being reëstablished or reorganized, and that speculation in cotton, however great an economic evil it might be, would not be done away with merely by lessening the size of the cotton crop. The fate of previous attempts to reduce the cotton acreage—rather an old story in the South—is not encouraging. As one business man put it, the efforts have usually resulted in seven farmers agreeing to cut their acreage by one-quarter or one-third, while three others, shrewdly concluding that the result would be a pretty fair price for cotton, increased their acreage by half. As for the demand for a larger acreage for feedstuffs and foodstuffs, that movement is already well under way throughout the Memphis farming district; indeed, the growing diversification of farming, and the increased production of hay, grain, cattle, poultry, fruit, and dairy products, is one of the most interesting agricultural developments of the region, and appears to be going on quite independently of the price of cotton.

The immediate development of the hardwood lumber industry, on the other hand, looks in a different direction. The local consumption of hardwood is negligible, and the Memphis producers have found their chief market in the furniture, tool, agricultural implement, and wagon industries of the North and Central West. The war has curtailed the production of both logs and lumber, and the stocks on hand are in each case small. So long as the present high prices continue, the post-war revival of the industries using hardwood, which has already set in and may normally be expected to increase rapidly, promises active business and substantial profits for the Memphis producers. The new feature is an enhanced interest in the foreign market, not, however, as a more profitable field than the domestic market, but mainly as a vent for such surplus production as cannot be sold at home. For the moment the foreign lumber trade is small, partly from lack of tonnage and the continuance of high prices here, and partly because of the unsettled condition of rail and ocean freight rates. It was odd to find a Memphis lumber dealer talking of competition with Japan in the English market, but the incident illustrated the world conditions of which American foreign trade has more and more to take account.

If there is any hostile criticism of the administration of the railways by the Federal Government, it was not emphasized by the business men with whom I talked. There was a generous disposition to admit that while some things have gone badly, and the Administration has both bungled and neglected the whole transportation situation so far as the immediate future is concerned, nevertheless substantial economies and conveniences have been effected and shippers on the whole fairly dealt with. There is always a shortage of cars for moving the cotton crop, but the situation appears to have been at least as good during the last two years as previously, especially when allowance is made for the war embargoes. As to the future, the prevailing opinion of Memphis business leaders appears to be most favorable to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a continuance of private ownership with Federal control, the actual operation of the railways being left, as formerly, in private hands, and with sufficient competition to insure *esprit de corps* and efficiency, but with strict supervision of the railways, both as financial investments and as operating plants, by the Federal Government, the maintenance of uniform rates, and the continuance of such useful coöperative features as joint use of terminals and equipment, joint freight and passenger offices, and the like.

Reference has been made to the Mississippi as having for Memphis a future rather than a present interest. According to figures furnished by the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, Memphis is served by twenty-one river steamers, with a total tonnage of 3,230 tons, and by barges aggregating about 6,000 tons. According to the last report of the Director-General of Railways, there are in service between St. Louis and New Orleans five towboats and twenty-nine barges, while the construction of six large steel towboats and forty steel barges, the latter of 2,000 tons each, has been authorized. The share of Memphis in the total commerce of the river is, apparently, small. The river steamers reach St. Louis and Cairo to the north and Vicksburg to the south, but there is no through service to New Orleans. Neither the city nor the State appears to be greatly interested in improving the terminal facilities, which at present, save for one private enterprise, are inferior. A municipal river terminal, recently acquired at a cost of about $250,000, will berth not more than two barges and can handle neither coal, cotton, nor lumber. It is pointed out by shippers that joint railway and river tariffs have been difficult to arrange under Government management, that up-stream cargoes are less certain than down-stream, and that freight at local river points must be brought from, or distributed to, interior points which are as easily reached by rail. The practical result, accordingly, is that the railways get all but a small percentage of the freight. What may happen when more Government barges are in service, or the increase of available ocean tonnage again taxes the ability of the railways to supply the necessary cargoes, remains to be seen; but it is a curious fact that with an immense volume of cotton, lumber, and coal to be moved, and the Mississippi at the door, Memphis should apparently view the commercial possibilities of the river with little concern.

It is easier to be unconcerned, however, because Memphis, on the whole, is prosperous. It has made money during the war, and while the typical Memphian is a good spender, bank deposits have increased and a good many debts have been paid. It is true that the street railway company has lately passed into the hands of receivers, but the recent award by the Federal War Labor Board of a wage increase of approximately sixty per cent., joined to the failure of the city to authorize as yet an increase in fares, affords a considerable part of the explanation. A draft of a new city charter, substituting a city manager for the commission government now in force, and making numerous other changes looking toward improved administration and clean politics, was made public on February 10 by a committee of representative citizens, with whom has been associated Professor A. R. Hatton, of Western Reserve University, as expert adviser. That there is a national labor problem of great seriousness the merchants, bankers, and manufacturers of Memphis are well aware, and they are watching closely its evolution, particularly in those industries and industrial centres with which Memphis has most to do; but the fact that approximately forty per cent. of the population of the city is colored, that there are practically no foreigners, and that organized labor is not a very influential factor among the Negroes, unquestionably gives to the labor problem as a whole an appearance of comfortable remoteness. It may well prove to be a saving grace for Memphis, in the troubled times that lie ahead of us, that its normal business outlook, while hardly cosmopolitan, is not local, and that its fortunes are not bound up with the development of any single industry.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

The Passing of Sir Wilfrid Laurier

By J. A. STEVENSON

"NOW is the stately column broke," and Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the ripe age of seventy-seven has crossed the bourne. His end was sudden and easy, and he died in harness. His career in public life was long, as the lives of statesmen go. Sprung by descent from an old French-Canadian family of the middle-class and born in 1841 in the little town of Arthabaskaville in Quebec, after being called to the bar he served for a brief space in the Quebec provincial legislature and entered the House of Commons in 1874, when the Liberals won their first victory after Confederation. His obvious talents were soon discerned, and he entered the Mackenzie Cabinet in 1877, but his party next year began a long exile in opposition. Chosen leader of the Liberals in 1887 to succeed Mr. Blake, he soon justified his selection and led his party from the wilderness to their great victory in 1896, which opened up a new epoch for Canada. Winning four successive elections, he remained Premier of Canada for fifteen years, the most prosperous and happy era in her history, till he was defeated in 1911 on the Reciprocity issue. Never did a statesman have a better cause, but his Ministry was stale and the Nationalistic propaganda of Mr. Bourassa disastrously beclouded the issue in Quebec. Yet the popular majority against him was small, and he continued to lead his party in opposition with great vigor and ability. In the early days of 1917 it seemed as if nothing could avert his immediate return to office. But the conscription issue intervened, and the majority of his English-speaking followers declined to support his course. Sir Wilfrid was in a difficult position. In no sense was he a pacifist, and he had given all the other war measures of the Government steady support. He could have accepted conscription and become Premier of Canada, but it would have cost him the affections of his own people in Quebec, who detested compulsory service. Mr. W. A. Charlton, a conscriptionist-Liberal M. P., testifies in a public letter that Sir Wilfrid deliberately forswore office to preserve the unity of Canada. He relates that, when urged by him to join Sir Robert Borden in forming a Union government, Sir Wilfrid said, "Charlton, you do what you think is right. I know you will. I live for the peace of Canada. We must hold the French. If I do not, they will drift to Bourassa, and we shall have a rebellion, which will please the Germans more than anything else that could happen." So he took his own road and met with a disastrous defeat at the polls; he preferred to stand or fall with his French-Canadian countrymen to whom he owed his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

career and whom he loved in a special degree. Yet ere a year had elapsed, he had rallied his party and was heading a formidable opposition which was recasting its programme to meet a more radical age and daily gaining strength in the country. He was still the foremost figure in Parliament, and his lightest utterance commanded such widespread attention that the Union Government with all its huge majority had perforce to take cognisance of all his words and actions.

Sir Wilfrid was of the Whig tradition, but of its liberal branch. An aristocrat in his bearing and manners, he might well have been of the patrician blood of Cavendish or Russell, but he had none of the aloofness towards democratic ideas and disdain of the plain folk which characterised many of the best English Whigs. He was never tired of tracing his political descent from the Liberalism of Fox, Grey, and Gladstone. "I am a Liberal of the English school," recurred time and again in his speeches; his grasp of British constitutional theory and political history was profound, and for forty years he strove to teach the French-Canadian people that British Liberalism was the highwater mark of political thought and should be their model. As a corollary to his steady faith in the virtues of the older Liberalism, he showed a certain apathy towards radical projects and new social movements. He would declare that youth ought to be ashamed not to be radical, but for himself he was old.

His services to Canada and the British Commonwealth cannot be lightly measured. He saw his country develop from a few scattered provinces into a united nation and played no small part in the process of unification. He strove at all times for the conciliation of the diverse racial elements of Canada, and laid himself out to be a teacher of liberal ideas and constitutional truths rather than an active reformer of institutions and mankind. Well did this great Frenchman serve the British race, for he led Canada from a certain narrow provincialism which was the creed of her earlier years to a clear realisation of her place and destiny in the British firmament and of the necessity of assuming responsibilities corresponding to her privileges. It was his further misfortune to be perennially attacked in the Protestant centres as a servile tool of the Roman Catholic Church. He lived and died a good Catholic, but a plaint servant of his church he never was. He won his first victory in 1896 in face of the solid hostility of the Quebec priesthood. His was the middle path, and he never left it. Much of the improvement in Canadian political debates must be credited to the sweetening influence of Sir Wilfrid's unfailing courtesy, fine temper, and idealistic approach to political problems, consistently maintained through his long career. His greatest asset was his unique and arresting personality. He had all the characteristically French gifts of intellect, clarity of thought, and grace of diction, but he was strangely British in spirit, in his generous courage, his hatred of fixed definitions and creeds, and his political empiricism. It must never be forgotten that his religion and race placed him in a position of peculiar difficulty for success in Canadian public life. But he surmounted it by sheer intellectual ability, force of character, and a certain magnetic personality. "He nothing mean or common did," and to the whole Canadian people his loss has brought a sense of personal bereavement, whose deep sincerity is the measure of their pride in his career. A future Canadian Thucydides will rate him as incorruptible as Pericles; in forty years of public life amid an environment that was often muddy, no shadow of a stain ever fell upon his public or private honor.

Foreign Correspondence

Personalities at Berne

Berne, February 7

THE hall in which I am writing certainly fits a gathering of representatives of the proletariat, in its plainness and bareness. Here are ninety-one delegates sitting at tables laden with literature of propaganda, resolutions of committees, and the printed records of proceedings. The air is thick with tobacco smoke despite large and threatening signs forbidding smoking. At the sides of the room are long tables at which are crowded the representatives of the press, who outnumber the delegates. There is not a lackey, not a uniform, not a decoration nor title; there is no guard of honor at the door, no formality, no ceremonial. There are no long lines of automobiles before the building, no waiters in dress suits to serve tea, no gilt, no braid, no candelabra! This is simply a hall in which plain men are meeting, and not the barbarously ornate hall on the Quai d'Orsay.

But there are greater differences than lie in the settings. For here is a real conference, in fullest publicity, with real debating, a conference of men and women, a conference of victors and vanquished alike, a conference not, it is true, without a President, for Kurt Eisner of Munich is here, but a conference which none the less is absolutely without official domination. Nobody in Berne is taking orders, and the gathering meets three times a day instead of twice in four weeks.

The wisdom of restricting the Conference to general lines speedily became apparent. To have attempted to settle all the territorial problems in a week's session was plainly impossible, so that the prime results of the Conference remain the burying of the hatchet, the interchange of opinions, the reconstitution of the Internationale, and the giving to the world of the first international charter of labor, and the various opinions expressed in the resolutions. But these results are well worth the effort.

It is strange to see that compared to previous meetings of the Internationale this is a conservative gathering. It no longer represents the extreme Left, as it did five years ago, but is actually scorned as too conservative by the Swiss Socialists, the Russian Bolshevists, who are as unrepresented here as at Paris, the Italian Minority Socialists, and, of course, the Spartacus group in Germany. What will the situation be a year hence? No one can mingle with the delegates without being profoundly impressed by their simplicity, their straightforwardness, their earnestness, their breadth of view, and their international aspirations for a just, a wiser, and a better world.

Though no Socialist myself, if I had the power to decide on which conference to rest the future of the world, I should unhesitatingly, and with real joy, decide for this simple conference with its plain membership. With profound respect for Mr. Wilson's achievements in Paris, I would take the whole making of peace out of governmental hands, out of those of the Clemenceaus, Lloyd Georges, and Orlandos, and place it here in the hands of a democratic gathering of democratic people, the real representatives of those who have fought, bled, and died for their countries.

The International Conference has brought together in one room a large number of the most interesting personalities

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Europe. It was, of course, a source of regret that there were no representatives of the Swiss, whose guests the Conference in a sense was, and one would have wished to see the Italian group which opposed the war so uncompromisingly. While it was well, in the matter of German and French disloyalty to the Socialist cause, to let bygones be bygones, it was none the less good to meet and hear the men who had inflexibly lived up to their principles. There was no Liebknecht to receive the plaudits of the audience, but the rather noisy hall grew still whenever Ramsay Macdonald spoke. This was not only the instinctive tribute to his superb presence, but an appreciation of his steadfast opposition to the war, maintained at so great a cost.

In marked contrast to Ramsay Macdonald is another extremely interesting figure—Kurt Eisner. In his hirsute appendages and bald head President Eisner strongly suggests Lyman Abbott, even though he is not tall or thin; but he speedily made it clear that these were the only points of resemblance. He spoke without effort at oratory, with few gestures, with clear enunciation, and the Conference listened in rapt attention. There was no doubt that he was a man of absolute courage and frankness, yet one meeting him on the street would set him down as a typical German pedagogue, the absent-minded professor dear to *Fliegende Blätter*. One would never guess him to be president of a very considerable country, and a successful revolutionist. The story of his revolution is so extraordinary that one naturally expects the leader to be a fiery young man of the Carl Schurz or Gustav Koerner type. He had been known in Munich before the attempted revolution of January, 1918, chiefly as a feuilletonist and a frequenter of cafés. But it is said that when with a handful of men he stormed the Landtag in an impromptu manner the Government abdicated and royalty ran away with a speed incredible even in a comic opera. This may be true, but after all there is something about Eisner which explains his being the right man at the right moment. He was himself in doubt, when he left this morning, whether he would be President much longer. But his reception here did distinct honor to Bavaria.

Every time that Frederick Adler took his place on the platform a thrill ran through the audience. He has all the appearance of a dry-as-dust pedagogue with a tremendous head of hair, stooped shoulders, and as marked prison pallor as if he had but yesterday left the cell in which he had so long awaited the executioner. As the lady beside me remarked, "He would have been dead long ago if Austria had had the courage to carry out his sentence." The revolution freed him and he is now addressed by all the Socialist leaders as Comrade Adler.

Two days before the end of the meeting, in walked an old man whose face was familiar. It was Eduard Bernstein, so long head of the Socialist Revisionists in Germany. He was full of his adventures in coming to the Conference over the worn-out railroads of Germany, but he seemed to exert no influence whatever.

Kautsky, with his gentle, spiritual personality, is by far the most attractive figure among the Germans and Austrians. Troëlstra, from Holland, is an extremely interesting figure. His refinement and culture are as obvious as his ability. Though this was a Labor as well as a Socialist Conference, it was only in the English delegation that one found men who had plainly had workshop experience. McGurk and Shirkie were unmistakably representative of the real sons of toil. Though inclined to be somewhat unreasonably obstreperous at times, they lent desirable color to the picture, for most of the Continental representatives were obviously of the agitator or Parliamentarian type.

The French delegation lent expected warmth and Gallic piquancy. Several of them talked too often, but they bore themselves well and generously, except for a professional Alsatian, and their violent roaring at one another was at times a joyous relief from the monotony of the double translations. (As every speech had to be delivered three times, as is usual at international gatherings, it is no wonder that Esperanto is regarded with growing favor.) There is no doubt, however, of the intense rivalry between Longuet and Renaudel which splits the French delegation.

On the platform sat Henderson, Branting, and Huysmans; the Englishman was gladly heard; the Swede with more reluctance, as he speaks three foreign tongues equally badly and as presiding officer let proceedings drag unnecessarily. Huysmans's keen, sensitive face was a delight to watch. His readiness to step in at just the right moment, with precisely the elucidating word or the exact compromise necessary stamped him as a most valuable secretary and leader. A Belgian with deep feelings, he is yet wholly without bitterness. Stuart Bunning also made two admirable speeches at critical moments. It was extraordinary how personal differences were set aside for the sake of the Internationale; under such circumstances it could not fail.

Chief among the women were the two from England, Mrs. Philip Snowden, and Margaret Bondfield, to whom Lloyd George denied a passport to go as a delegate to meet with the American Federation of Labor, despite her great services to the working women of England. Near the door, an interested spectator, sat Rosika Schwimmer, of Ford Peace Ship fame, temporarily Hungarian Minister to Switzerland.

Two interesting men from Germany were frequently in the audience: first, Professor Wilhelm Förster, who held his chair in the University of Münich despite his resolute opposition to the war and his insistence that Germany was in the wrong. He is a strikingly handsome man of great ability, and is now Bavarian Minister to Switzerland by appointment of President Eisner. The second, whose remarkable revelations did so much to prove to the world at large the full guilt of Germany—Dr. Muehlon. He begs me to tell the *Nation's* readers that the condition of the children in Germany is dire beyond words, so many of them are dying from undernourishment and actual starvation. He begs us to do what we can to help the little ones whose condition will be still worse if the Allies continue the blockade and delay the peace. This I am the more willing to do as Dr. Muehlon's services to the United States and the war were such as preclude undesirable propaganda.

It only remains to touch in this letter upon a subject which makes every American here thoroughly ashamed. I refer to the attack upon the Conference by Messrs. Gompers, Walling, and Russell, to which the Conference has officially replied through its officers, Hjalmar Branting and Arthur Henderson. It had seemed as if Mr. Gompers and his associates had done all that they could in the way of misrepresentation of those who do not agree with them as to policy, but in this attack they have clearly outdone themselves in vituperation and mandacity. It is a great pity that the United States should be unrepresented at this vital con-

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Land of the Free

By FREDERIC ALMY

HOW free is the land of the free, and how free should it be? Must "free" be taken now in a limited sense, and interpreted vaguely like some of the commandments and beatitudes such as "Thou shalt not kill" and "Blessed are the peace-makers," which must be modified to-day if they are to pass the Espionage Act? We all remember how the South interpreted the inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; much as some good people interpret their creeds. "I believe in believing all that I say I believe" is a satire that does not apply to creeds only.

Those who felt for the slaves but dared not speak were themselves slaves. As Lowell said before our Civil War:

> They are slaves who will not choose
> Hatred, scoffing, and abuse
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth they needs must think;
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

Truth does not change, but our knowledge of truth changes. The Inquisition burned Protestants for the glory of God and for the protection of society. President Wilson has changed as the war advanced, but Roosevelt changed also after he said in the *Outlook*, September 23, 1914, of Belgium: "Sympathy is compatible with full acknowledgment of the unwisdom of our uttering a single word of official protest unless we are prepared to make that protest effective; and only the clearest and most urgent national duty would ever justify us in deviating from our rule of neutrality and non-interference."

Lowell said in the Biglow papers, after his country had declared war on Mexico, "Ez for war, I call it murder. There you hev' it plain an' flat." If he had said this to-day would he have had a ten years' sentence, like Debs, under the Espionage Act, and would the general public have applauded? The Mexican war was unpopular, but need a popular more than an unpopular war imprison those who criticise?

The espionage acts have an excuse in war time, but how about the muzzle which is still placed on Socialists in conservative America? When Max and Crystal Eastman spoke lately in Buffalo they were repeatedly stopped by the police, not for what they said, but because they were Socialists and editors of the *Liberator*. The *Liberator*, née *Masses*, changed its nature with its name, as is often the case, and shed some excesses. As the *Masses* it was an emetic as well as a tonic, but as the *Liberator* it is still a Socialist magazine. The Eastmans were not allowed to speak in Buffalo on any of their announced subjects,—free speech, withdrawal from Russia, and release of political prisoners,—but the police taboo brought in nearly three thousand dollars from their audience. It might be profitable for them to subsidize the police.

All three of these subjects are allowed in the *Nation* or at reputable conferences, such as were called in Rochester by the National Municipal League or in New York by the *Survey*, but Socialists may not speak on these subjects because they are Socialists. And yet Socialism of the better sort is to its disciples a religion. It is a gospel of hope and opportunity of the most American sort. Socialism fights against poverty, and poverty is a more dangerous, a more brutal and a more permanent enemy than Germany. When we fight Socialism, we may perhaps help that enemy. It is difficult for those who work much with and for the poor not to be to some extent Socialists. Socialists have at least average character and intelligence. Bring to mind such Socialist friends as you have, and consider whether this is not so. In England, in France, in Belgium, Socialism is in the cabinet instead of in jail.

It has been pointed out that extreme Socialism is the bogey at the Paris peace table, just as democracy was the great bogey at the Vienna peace table in 1815. Like democracy then, Socialism was never so unpopular as to-day and never so successful.

If it be true that 30,000 people in England own or control over 98 per cent. of the capital, as is stated in a leading article in the *Survey*, December 21, those who seek to upset or to reform such a society are not altogether at fault. In this country there is opportunity for men of extraordinary ability to rise to the top and to exploit those of less ability, but not enough opportunity and perhaps also not enough protection for the average man. Giant ability may be as dangerous to society as giant power, which it too often gets and misuses.

What rights of speech or of act has an independent, and how far should community rights be allowed to fetter individual rights? When Roger Baldwin, with a courage and character which all must admire, chose jail to prove that he did not approve of jailing, was he logical in his protest against the conscription of life? He says he went to jail not as a pacifist but as an individualist, and in behalf of liberty rather than of peace. Would he go so far as to say that an anarchist should refuse jury service as a conscription of life, or that a conscientious drinker should choose jail in a dry State?

Mr. Baldwin is an idealist of the best type, as his whole life proves, but this gay lover of woods and of wild things is in jail for principle. We say he should obey the law, and yet, as he reminds us, we praise those who disobeyed the Fugitive Slave law. What protest is so effective as rebellion, and is rebellion never justifiable? When successful a rebellion is only a revolution, like ours against England, and revolutions often make the wheels of the world revolve.

Germany is now harmless, and if we do not want the spirit of Germany to conquer, with its hate and brutality, we should release to-morrow every conscientious objector. They are our bravest. It takes more courage to dare or to die for a crown of thorns than for a crown of laurel. When President Wilson spoke at the funeral of the seventeen American sailors killed at Vera Cruz, he said: "I never was under fire, but I fancy there are some things just as hard to do as to go under fire. I fancy it is just as hard to do your duty when men are sneering at you as when they are shooting at you. . . . The cheers of the moment are not what a man ought to think about, but the verdict of his conscience."

"Who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?" says Milton. We must not penalize pioneers who seek truth, or be her executioner because we fail to know her behind her veil.

> Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,
> Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown,
> Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The County of Mayo

(Translated from the Irish of Antony Raftery)

By PADRAIC COLUM

Now, coming on Spring, the days will be growing,
And after Saint Bride's Day my sail I will throw;
Since the thought has come to me I fain would be going,
Till I stand in the middle of the County Mayo.

The first of my days will be spent in Claremorris,
And in Balla beside it I'll have drinking and sport;
To Kiltimagh then I shall go on a visit,
And there, I can tell you, a month will be short.

I solemnly swear that the heart in me rises
As the wind rises up and the mist breaks below,
When I think upon Carra and on Gallen down from it,
The Bush of the Mile and the Plain of Mayo!

Killeadean's my village, and every good's in it,
The rasp and blackberry, and all kinds of fruit;
Och, if Raftery stood there in the midst of his people,
From the depth of old age he would step to his youth!

In the Driftway

THE Drifter was reading what the "other half" was writing, and in the article on "The Life That Really Is" he found a brother of the pen asking whether it was "conceivable that any one any where has not been wholly occupied with the war and its politics all these four years." The Drifter begs to answer a solemn "yes." He once saw such a person. He heard her speak. It was the month of August of the year nineteen hundred and eighteen. An old woman walked into the office of a neutral steamship line. She explained that her husband had died, that she was old and lonely and wanted to go back home. The agent said that he would be delighted to sell her a ticket, but she must first get a passport. "A passport," she asked, "but why? I did not know that a passport was necessary." The agent explained that it was necessary on account of the war. "The war," she asked with genuine surprise, "is there a war?" The Drifter had visions of the blessed islands of ignorance. Here was a chance to discover their exact location. "Madam," he interrupted, "I beg your pardon, but where do you come from now?" "From the Hudson Bay, two hundred miles beyond Fort Hope. I have lived there for the last twenty years. It was a very quiet spot and we used to be without snow for a whole month every year."

* * * * *

THE Drifter looked through the bales of paper which represented the latest Sunday editions. There were photographs of famous ladies and infamous criminals—snapshots of the President receiving the freedom of half a dozen nations and pictures of less elevated conscientious objectors receiving the freedom of half a dozen jails. There was the smiling countenance of old Clemenceau kissing Alsatian babies and the dejected figure of the former Crown-prince wading through the mud of his Dutch island. Suddenly the Drifter gave a start. His eye encountered a sight of great promise. Sir Douglas Haig in civilian clothes; surely a most hopeful sign in these disappointing days. Let statesmen and nationalistic agitators talk about the perpetuity of all armies. Let us all wear green, purple, yellow, and gold service stripes. The gallant and brave leader of Britain's armies knew better. He was called to perform a certain task. He did his work well. Then he went to Hanover street and ordered a suit of tweeds. We had come to know Sir Douglas as a great soldier. We salute him as a man of sense.

* * * *

THE Drifter dropped in at the studio on the south side of the Square. "What in the name of Captain Kidd—!" he gasped. The artist kept on splashing red paint. "I've struck it at last," he remarked complacently. "The fellows who made fortunes on service flags may take a back seat." The Drifter shuddered as he saw table, floor, and walls littered with grisly emblems. "Why not?" continued the artist. "See what's happening. We ship off these near-Bolsheviks as too advanced for us; Russia declines to accept them as back-numbers. Is there anything for them but a ferry? We send our prohibition agitators off for a well-earned vacation—while we guess again—and England sticks up her no trespass signs. Mid-Europeans who came over to sample before purchasing and find citizenship not as advertized, have no fatherland to welcome them, the mother country having married again and the step-sister states having embezzled the patrimony. What is there for all of these but a life on the open wave? They'll pay good prices for these vexing submarines, and there you have the new Brotherhood of Amalgamated Pirates." "And these bloody banners?" queried the Drifter? "Doesn't a family have to brag when its menfolks are drafted? Here's a skull-and-crossbones for every contributing household. The red is my own invention—carrying out the red flag idea; rather tasty, eh?" The Drifter whistled thoughtfully. "I see—a Soviet of the Seas."

* * * *

AT Thirty-Fourth street the kitten decided to cross the Avenue. Carefully she put a paw into the hasty current of gasoline traffic. A snorting automobile almost washed her away. The kitten returned to the safe shelter on the sidewalk and hoisted a black tail of distress. Behold, her rescue was near! The policeman had noticed her misery. A white-gloved hand went up into the air, a shrill whistle was blown and a leisurely kitten crossed America's busiest thoroughfare at her own deliberate gait. The Drifter saw this and the Drifter liked it. The world is full of dreadful Bolsheviks and the world is full of dreadful Reactionaries and the world is full of Indifferent People and they are worse. But when we can all come together and cheerfully assist a black kitten to cross safely from Altman's to the Waldorf-Astoria—there is hope.

THE DRIFTER

Contributors to this Issue

FREDERICK TUPPER is professor of English in the University of Vermont.

JOHN P. FOX is secretary of the Murray Hill Association in New York and an expert on city transit problems.

J. A. STEVENSON is a Canadian journalist.

FREDERIC ALMY is secretary of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

The Glasgow Workers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish that all Americans of comfortable circumstances and well-fed families could be brought to Glasgow to see the laboring people, pale, hollow-chested, poorly clad, haggard-faced —the third and fourth generation of factory hands—and the terrible slums they inhabit. We in America have nowhere reached, as yet, this specialization in physical deterioration. We are too young, as yet, in human exploitation. In Glasgow nineteenth century *laissez-faire* and free competition and the middle classes have done as they chose. And now their doing will require years of bitter struggle and years of bitter undoing.

H. G. A.

Glasgow, February 4

Not Guilty, My Lord

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your Philadelphian correspondent who wants his paper stopped, reminds me that my own subscription shortly becomes due. I suppose I shall renew; the habit of a third of a century is strong on me. But I have two minds in the matter and no heart.

Unlike your other correspondent, however, I do not object to the "Bolshevik." What troubles me is that the *Nation* lately has been getting so appallingly commonplace. I don't mind your patting my enemies on the back or sticking out your tongue at my friends, if only you would not say such obvious things about both that you no longer teach me anything about either.

In short, the *Nation* has largely lost its old distinction, and is rapidly dropping to the mental level of the ———. Even the punctuation has gone bad. I wish you wouldn't. If the *Nation* becomes unreadable, where is one to turn?

E. T. BREWSTER

Andover, Mass., January 25

Manifold France

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Whenever you mention "France's attitude" it might be well to specify which France you mean. The France of Clemenceau, of Lysis of the Comité des Forges (which sacrificed thousands of men on the Alsace-Lorraine front that their properties might not be damaged by bombardment), the official France which is acting as official Germany would have acted had Mr. Hohenzollern and his clique prevailed, the France of the Confederation of Labor, with a membership of 1,000,000 paid-up members, the France of the War Veterans, with a membership of 400,000 led by Barbusse, the France that means the *Populaire* or *l'Humanité*, or the France of Jean Longuet and Loriot. . . .

As against Chéradame who moved that "well paid propagandists be sent to the United States to confer with all of Mr. Wilson's enemies to the end that the Senate may veto any treaty he signs," I might recall to you the beautiful letter from Barbusse which, in behalf of radical France, hailed Woodrow Wilson as the greatest idealist and the loftiest figure of the day.

Should Mr. Wilson fail in his mission, I have no doubt that liberal France which is back of him will ruthlessly throw into the discard her present government, the visible catspaw of international financiers, and will swing as far to the "left" as Russia. Remember what the Confederation of Labor stands for.

TRIDON

New York, February 26

Another Plea for the Classics

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read with no slight interest Professor Gummere's plea for the study of Latin, which appeared in a recent number of the *Nation;* and while I am in full agreement with him in the plans he suggests and the arguments he advances, scarcely a suggestion in the whole article applies to my own experience in the study of Latin. In spite of the fact that my professional work has been in the field of science, and my associations have been almost wholly with men who look coldly upon the study of the classics, I wish to affirm most emphatically that the school study from which I derived the greatest benefit was Latin.

So far as cases, conjugations, and rules of syntax are concerned, I merely "got" them at the time when the memory faculty was strong and active. I have them now after the lapse of more than half a century. But the learning of them was not learning Latin; it was merely the mastering of a memory task. My first real Latin discovery was that accipiter, a hawk, derived its name from accipere, "to seize"; and that the Roman peasant therefore named this predatory bird "the snatcher." It was a great discovery, and at once I began to dig beneath the surface of Latin words. Thus I successively learned the literal meaning of such words as "dilapidate," "redemption," "dejection," "salary," "rapture," "bankrupt," "capricious," "calculate," "tribulation," "musket," and a host of others.

My most intimate friend was a youngster nicknamed "Chawkey"; and as a student he was one after my own heart. Chawkey had a method in making his translations. He used to translate phrases and clauses each by itself; then, having dug out a subject and a predicate, he whipped them into a pretty well-arranged sentence. This process he called "stringing." Years afterward I read Herbert Spencer's essay on the philosophy of style; and before I had read a dozen pages the whole thing was plain. It is dollars to doughnuts that Spencer evolved his ideas when, as a fourth form boy, he practiced stringing Caesar. All the same, the practice of arranging the parts of a sentence by this method gave me the power to express myself clearly and precisely; in other words, it laid the foundation of whatever literary style I may be fortunate enough to possess.

So far as the classics are concerned, the one Latin book that appealed to me was the first that I read. It was a brief history of Rome apparently cribbed from the Breviarium of Eutropius. No one would have regarded it more seriously than as literature of the Peter Parley type. Nevertheless I cannot conceive it in any other light than an important foundation in my education. I read and reread it until I knew much of it by heart. After an interval of more than half a century I still remember many passages. One passage has never failed to impress itself on me: "*Hinc Aeneas, Anchisae filius*"—I hope I quote it correctly—"*cum multis Trojanis quibus ferrum Graecorum pepercerat aufugit, et in Italiam pervenit.*" When I first tried to read the paragraph, I wondered why Anchises named his *filius* "Hinc"; it struck me that Hank Aeneas would have been more in keeping. Nevertheless, little by little it came to me that because of the fall of Troy there came the flight of Aeneas; and because of the flight of Aeneas, the sheep ranches in Latium, the trading post at Alba Longa, the port at the mouth of the Tiber, the walled town of Rome, and its growth to a state, the tremendous development of commerce, the Justinian code, and the Romanization of the whole western world. And all of this developed, not from a study of classical Latin, but from a brief history that could not be dignified even as vulgate Latin. And all this harks back to Professor Gummere's opinion that, if in the future Latin is to be made a useful study, the utilitarian and not the aesthetic value must be the educational basis of the study. In my own case it was not only utilitarian; it was vocational.

JACQUES W. REDWAY, F.R.G.S.

Mount Vernon, N. Y., March 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Illumination of Defeat

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: I have just had my first word from Germany, or rather from a German living now in Switzerland, Gustav Maier of Zürich, formerly a Berlin banker and active for years in the German *Gesellschaft für ethische Kultur;* and possibly extracts from an open letter addressed to his German friends which he incloses will be of wider interest, as showing the temper and spirit in which some Germans now take their country's decisive defeat.

"Every fate of a nation is due to its own fault. Advancing in wealth, we have remained behind in the things of the mind. Trade became our idol, Mammon our God. For an hundred years there has been no free development of political life among us. Our upper strata thought only of themselves and surrendered political leadership to the government, the political education of the people to social democracy.

"Only the weakling broods supinely over his misfortune, seeks scapegoats for his own fault and thinks he is absolved when he can point to the sins of others. The strong man beats his own breast, and out of darkness advances to the light.

"We shall still have our 'place in the sun' again, even if after bad weather. It need not be, however, the sun of Africa or Asia—the sun of our own fatherland is nearer and gives more temperate heat. Self-knowledge is the first step in conversion. It may come hard to us elders to cast behind us long-cherished false ideals and tread narrower paths, but the new generation will do it.

"With strong resolve we must renounce all power-politics—on land, on sea and in the air—regardless of whether our present enemies in the blind exaltation of victory go further along the other way. Indeed, victory is often in truth a defeat.

"Perhaps the dream of an efficient workers' army will be realized, which in the place of drill will carry out, with our proved gift for organization, great collective undertakings in the struggle with nature: improvements of the soil, building of canals and other means of intercourse, in short 'inner colonization.' In so doing our brave soldiers and officers will win, indeed, no laurels, but gain the Faust feeling 'of standing with a free people on free soil,' 'of daily conquering liberty and life.'

"We shall also have to bid farewell to our fleet, since it pleases others so well. For the time we shall not have our colonies back, analphabetic Negro princes without number having announced over their own signature their desire for English rule. . . . But were we not happy, much happier than now, four decades ago, without fleet or colonies?

"Civilized mankind stands to-day at the parting of the ways. . . . We must be equal to both possibilities: either the victorious peoples will under the old illusions again be untrue to the aim of peaceful reconciliation, which they have so proudly preached, in which case we can leave them to the inevitable consequences of their continuing illusion of power, and labor all by ourselves for our inner rehabilitation; or a better time of reciprocal toleration, of an approach to the fraternizing of peoples, is actually dawning, in which event Germany will at the appointed hour be the ripest member of the new world.

"Momentarily there is every ground for doubting the better tendency, but impossible it is not. To-morrow may bring reality to what was yesterday a Utopia. Who could have foreseen a few years ago that the political emancipation of woman would become a world-wide reality? Who would have thought that Germany, winning all battles, would lose the war, and just by that means become republican?

"We have applied our mental energy too much to outward things: let us turn about. . . . And then we shall have won again the respect and sympathy of the world."

William M. Salter

Cambridge, February 10

The Gold Brick Twins

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: Two organizations that should be known as the Gold-Brick Twins, viz., the League to Enforce Peace and the League of Free Nations Association, are holding joint conferences in various important centres. It appears that the League to Enforce Peace, through its executive committee, has coolly abandoned the proposals formulated at the historic gathering in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in 1915, proposals that had been presented to the public as the matured judgment of the wisest men in America. The fact is that those proposals were such as to make the "League to Enforce Peace"—with the word "Enforce" printed in the color of blood—a good deal of a joke. A precisely descriptive alternative name would have been "A League to Make War in Order to Secure a Certain Delay Before War is Made." Josh Billings had said long before, "Resolved, To keep out of debt if I have to borrow money to do it."

The two organizations named above have jointly adopted a "Victory Programme," avowing the aim to "insure the fruits of victory" in a war which "has been above all a war to end war." This "Victory Programme" has a humorous feature which should be much enjoyed in the conferences. It lies in the naïve disregard of the mathematical axiom that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts. According to the "Victory Programme," the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts with the exception of one—or perhaps two or three or more—of its parts. President Lowell is not usually regarded as a humorist, though it is generally well known that Mr. Taft dearly loves a joke.

Now, if one of the covenanting states should break faith and attack a sister state, then all the others, faithful to their agreement, could support with their combined forces that wronged sister against the offending state. But those combined forces would not be the "strength of the whole," but of the whole minus one part of the whole. It would make a tremendous difference how powerful that one part was. There is no warrant for the assumption that it will always be some weak nation that will prove faithless. It is the mighty nations, rather than the weak, that will be tempted. Nor can it safely be assumed that it will always be only one nation at a time, and never two or more in collusion, that will treat their covenant as a mere scrap of paper. Still further, when providing for cases of bad faith, we should bear in mind the extreme probability that if one or more of the nations should violate their pledged word and engage in acts of aggression, then one or more of the other nations would be in sympathy with those wicked ones at least to the extent that they would not coöperate in an effort to subdue them by force, but would refuse—like Meroz of old—to "come to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

The "worldwide control of economic resources," as well as military and naval power, is to be used—according to the plan under consideration—in disciplining a recalcitrant nation. But suppose the recalcitrant nation itself controls a considerable portion of all the resources on the planet, including certain materials which are lacking or scarce in all the other nations—how in the name of mathematics can "worldwide control of economic resources be employed against it?"

President Wilson deserves high rank among the political humorists of to-day. His most recent joke—so far as reported—occurs in the eloquent speech delivered in the French Chamber of Deputies the other day in which he said that "whenever France or any free people is threatened, the whole world will be ready to vindicate its liberty"—which thoroughly repudiates the axiom I have quoted and assumes that the whole world minus a part—and God knows how large a part—of the whole world will still be the whole world.

Henry W. Pinkham

Winthrop, Mass., January 6

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Poetry and Life

The Necessity of Poetry. By Robert Bridges. New York: Oxford University Press. 90 cents.

"THE human mind in its present state is unequal to its own powers of apprehension; it embraces more than it can master." These words of Newman might have served Mr. Bridges as the text of his discourse on "The Necessity of Poetry." The title reminds us of the striking paragraph with which Arnold opened his famous introduction to Ward's "English Poets." He, too, thought poetry necessary, because men must more and more turn to it for the consolation and the interpretation of life that were formerly supplied by religion. "The strongest part of our religion to-day," he wrote, "is its unconscious poetry." But Mr. Bridges's reason for believing in the necessity of poetry is very different from Arnold's. Poetry is necessary not as a substitute for religion in cultivated minds, but as the only possible expression of a certain order of ideas which are essential to the integrity of our mental life. It is, therefore, literally necessary to every man, and not least to the intelligent workingman, whom Mr. Bridges is here addressing.

The ideas which poetry expresses involve a range of concepts that are too indefinite for scientific or philosophic expression, and yet are perfectly real. They deal with intellectual conceptions that can only be suggested, because they are half emotion; with profound intuitions, which, as soon as they are challenged by the reason, become "fallings from us, vanishings," but are "yet a master-light of all our seeing." "It is difficult to quiet a suspicion," writes Mr. Bridges, "that the natural indefinite quality of our ideas may be a healthy condition; and that the key to the mysteries of life, which is withheld from philosophical exactitudes, may lie in that very condition of our thought which Reason rejects as unseizable and elusive." It was the atrophy of the power to apprehend such ideas that Darwin was really lamenting in the oft-quoted passage of his Autobiography, to which Mr. Bridges also refers. "The loss of these tastes," Darwin wrote, meaning a taste for poetry, music, and landscape, "is a loss of happiness, and may possibly be injurious to the intellect, and more probably to the moral character, by enfeebling the emotional part of our nature." These words imply the truth that it is all but impossible to discriminate between æsthetic and religious or ethical concepts as they lie in the background of the mind. In these regions, beauty is indeed truth, and truth beauty. Evidently a form of utterance that will even suggest these inexpressible matters may be counted among the necessities of our mental life.

Moreover, the bringing of these concepts to light, the ordering and shaping of them into intelligible form, is a hidden and instinctive process, not unlike that by which we arrive at religious certitude, as it is described by Newman in a famous passage of the "University Sermons." "No analysis," he writes, "is subtle and delicate enough to represent adequately the state of mind under which we believe, or the subjects of belief, as they are presented to our thoughts." Mr. Bridges makes much of this "spontaneous activity" of the poet's mind, and he defines a genius as "a man whose mind has most of a right spontaneous activity of the concepts among themselves,"—meaning by "right," we suppose, one that is intelligible to ordinary reasoning beings, however much beyond their own powers.

Now the results of this poetic activity of mind, which we call inspiration, are expressed by means of the "magic of language," which is itself a result of the same activity. The form of poetry is as "necessary" as its substance. But this truth, it seems to us, Mr. Bridges has not sufficiently emphasized. He does indeed remark that there is "a very close and real connexion" between "words as ideas" and "words as vocal sounds." He also says that "even when there is no *conscious* art, the very sense of the beauty of the thought will tend to produce a sympathetic corresponding beauty in the language." But he does not insist, as we think he ought, upon what might be called the inspirational identity of form and substance in great poetry. This is what Arnold meant by speaking of the "inevitability" of Wordsworth's poetry at its best—"as inevitable as Nature herself." This will readily be granted as far as the triumphs of poetry are concerned; but we are not sure that poetry very far from triumphant may not also, in its degree, illustrate it. Jefferies accused Keats of taking in "Endymion" "the first word that presented itself to make up a rhyme," and then making "that word the germ of a new cluster of images." The Quarterly reviewer made the same charge, but was unfortunate in his illustration. He asserted that "the grandeur of the dooms We have imagined for the mighty dead" (surely an admirable and appropriate image) would never have intruded itself but for the "fair musk-rose blooms" of the preceding line. But is it not possible that this very fact illustrates the subtle fashion in which the "spontaneous activity" of the poet's mind manifests itself? The exigencies of rhyme do not always permit the poet to say the thing he would, but they sometimes compel him to say a better thing—"such harmony is in immortal souls."

In dealing with metre, also, Mr. Bridges does not, in our judgment, sufficiently insist upon its "necessity." He almost implies that it is a mere convention inherited from the Greeks, and dependent for its justification chiefly upon the authority of their taste. He goes no further than to hope that he has "demonstrated the propriety and almost the necessity of the metrical form of poetry." But if anything is clear in these matters it is that our pleasure in metre—in Milton's blank verse, for example—is not merely a pleasure in the sense of difficulty overcome, the pleasure proper to technique, though it is this also; it is the pleasure incident to the perception of variety in uniformity, and this, like the pleasure in symmetry or in imitation, is an æsthetic ultimate. This is obviously the reason why a good deal of "free verse" is so unsatisfactory; the ear misses the "pattern," and it is not compensated for the loss, except in the very best examples, by the perception of the essential rightness of the metrical form, its perfect expressiveness. For it would not be difficult to convince lovers of poetry that metre too, as well as ideas and language, is the result of the "spontaneous activity" of the poet's mind,—that it is, in a word, "inevitable." It is no extravagance of admiration that leads F. W. H. Myers to say of Virgil that "his thoughts seem to come to us on the wings of melodies prepared for them from the foundation of the world." But of the necessity of metre in this sense Mr. Bridges has not a word to say.

The second part of the address, entitled "Art for the Workingman," considers the necessity of poetry from another angle. Poetry is necessary not merely because it is the only possible way of expressing certain ideas, but also because it offers to the workingman a "spiritual contact" which, unless he is unusually fortunate, his work does not provide. Hence it is important that he shall be taught to discriminate the genuine from the spurious in poetry, "for nothing is less like a work of art than its imitation," and this for an obvious reason: the essence of poetry being a "spontaneous," that is, an instinctive and subconscious, activity of the creative imagination, evidently the attempt to simulate this activity defeats itself. Incidentally it should be said that by "spontaneous" Mr. Bridges does not mean instantaneous. The spontaneity of the process is not at all inconsistent with conscious, critical effort; indeed it is a test of an artist's rank whether his retouchings actually better his work. Though he does not explicitly say so, it is clear that Mr. Bridges regards the distinction between genuine and spurious poetry as based upon the ideas that respectively inform them. This, in any case, would be a necessary inference from his conception of the poetic process. He does say plainly that the problem of poetry is only another aspect of the problem

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of religion and the problem of morals, for they all three spring from certain "primary emotions of Man's Spirit." Hence poetry is of necessity a more adequate expression of the essential truths of both religion and morals than either theology or philosophy can be; it belongs to the same order of ideas. To assert, therefore, that art is non-moral is to deny its essence, to isolate it from its great kindred. "Pure Ethics," says Mr. Bridges, "is man's moral beauty," and can therefore be expressed only in the language of beauty. And so we are led to recognize from another angle the necessity of poetry.

This will of course seem to many persons of many schools of criticism the shallowest sort of evasion of the real question, a kind of belated Ruskinism. We contend, on the contrary, that it is useful occasionally to be reminded, and reminded by a poet, that poetry is something more than metrical expression—more even than "imagism." There are, to be sure, other tests of poetry than the test of ideas, but they merely qualify, they do not supersede, this. Overstated it may easily be, or at any rate inexactly stated. It inevitably involves its exponent in something like platitude; but in these matters it is precisely the platitudes—that is, the fundamental considerations—that are most easily forgotten. Mr. Bridges, at any rate, has succeeded in stating them in a novel and convincing fashion.

The lecture closes upon the honored name of William Morris, whose influence, more perhaps than that of any other man, is to be seen in such coöperative societies of workingmen as that for which this address was prepared. In the spirit of Morris, Mr. Bridges points out the need of collaboration on the part of his hearers in the effort to give artistic expression to the profound and formative ideas which underlie all life worthy of the name. Yet, "in Art, as in Religion," he says finely and truly, "we look for salvation in individual emotion"; and therefore it is the duty of the workingman to become acquainted with sound artistic tradition if he is to collaborate to much purpose in the task of giving art its proper place in modern life. "The cause of art," said Morris, "is the cause of the people," for without art the deepest, truest, most consoling intuitions of the human spirit remain forever unexpressed.

Glimpses of Russia

The Dark People. By Ernest Poole. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.50.

The Village. By Ernest Poole. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.50.

IT can not be expected that a book on Russia written after a stay of only a few weeks in that country should be authoritative and correct. Mr. Poole's "The Dark People" is no exception in this respect. The author erroneously assumes that ninety per cent. of the Russian people are peasants, and that the industrial population amounts to only ten per cent. Starting upon such an assumption, he suggests that little heed need be paid to the cities, and that we have to look to the "dark people" in the villages for a solution of Russia's problems. And since those people "have not yet made their voices heard," it would appear that the solution is far off. This assumption gives the reader a totally wrong idea of conditions and the interrelation of the social forces at work in Russia. The error can easily be corrected by recourse to statistics. The Russian census of 1897 gives the peasant population as eighty-one per cent. of the total of 149,000,000. It must be remembered that the word "peasants" in the Russian classification does not mean all who live in villages and are actually engaged in agricultural pursuits. It is a class division; and, although millions of the persons thus classified were employed in trades, industries, and other occupations in the cities, they still appeared as peasants in the census. Russian industries have grown considerably since that time, and it is safe to assert that fully forty per cent., perhaps even more, of the working population of Russia is non-agricultural. That the peasants do take an interest in matters of government is shown by the author himself, who states that a Peasants' Congress of 1,325 delegates from all parts of Russia met in the summer of 1917. It may be added that another such Congress assembled in the autumn of that year.

The most enlightening part of the book, however, is to be found in Mr. Poole's interviews with military men, peasants, and revolutionists who know their country more or less intimately. These give one an insight into Russia's state of mind. General Verkhovsky, subsequently Minister of War in Kerensky's Cabinet, explained the collapse of the Russian front by saying that the Russian soldiers had no idea what they were fighting for. They knew merely that they had to obey the Czar or be flogged. "And so, when the war had lasted two years, the men began to show signs of revolt. In the summer of 1916, the whole Seventh Siberian Army Corps refused to advance; and this was no isolated fact. With little or no understanding of what they were fighting for, the soldiers mutinied time and again. I found disorders last winter at many points along the front. There was lack of food and fuel, of clothing and munitions. There was scrofula and scurvy all along the Russian line."

After the revolution the soldiers would not obey the officers, as they feared that this might lead them back to the old régime. Urged by the Bolsheviki to rise against the "bourgeoisie," the soldiers turned against the officers who were the only representatives of the "bourgeoisie" at the front. This movement was stimulated by German agents. "The situation was made worse by the fact that the Allies refused to agree to the Russian peace terms of 'No annexations or contributions.' The Russian soldier gathered from this that the Allies did want annexations. He put them down as imperialists who were in the war for what they could get out of it."

Another factor which made it hard to continue the war was the peasants' land-hunger. The peasant soldiers demanded peace so that they could go home and take possession of the land. The Provisional Government had to tell them to wait until after the war was over. The great interest in the land question was not confined to the soldiers at the front. The author talked with a middle-aged, well-to-do peasant, vice-president of his district land committee, who came from a Volga province to attend the Peasants' Congress. "He was profoundly interested in just one thing, and that was the land—not the land of all Russia, but of his immediate neighborhood. You could see that his mind was back there as he talked, and that *his revolution* was there and that it was so absorbing to him he had no time for such trivial things as cities, wars, or Kaisers."

Mr. Poole finds that the Bolsheviks have lasted much longer than many predicted because "not only the workingmen in towns but more and more of the great 'dark people' out in the villages gave the Lenine-Trotzky group either active or passive support, because of all Russian radicals the Bolsheviki were the first to stop talking and take action on the two things the peasants want most—land and peace." He thinks that even if the Bolsheviks should be overthrown, the Soviet will remain, for "it includes all the labor and Socialist groups and has deep roots in the popular faith. It will be hard to shatter now."

"The Village" is a very interesting record of the author's impressions of country life in Russia. Mr. Poole visited the peasants in their huts, attended a theatrical performance at the village school, sat with raftsmen around their bonfire on the river bank at night, and talked with small landowners, village priests, and teachers. A country doctor said to him: "You must not think of our peasants as an ignorant, hopeless mass. It is not so. With real education they will build up a very wonderful nation here. The proof of this is that even under the old régime, which treated the peasants like so many dogs, strong men kept rising out of them. Some went to the cities and got rich. In Moscow are many millionaires who began life in peasants' huts. And in the villages themselves are the men who are shrewd and thrifty."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chronicles of a Noted Art Club

The Salmagundi Club. By William Henry Shelton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $5.

IN a handsomely printed edition, limited to five hundred copies (enough, probably, to meet the demand of members of the club, for whom the book was evidently written), we have a friendly record of the origin of the Salmagundi Club of New York and its growth from the little free-and-easy meetings at a modest Broadway studio, through various phases and vicissitudes, into a prosperous organization, with a house of its own on Fifth Avenue. Mr. Shelton has been a member since the beginning, and he tells the story with friendly intimacy, almost tenderness, as if no event connected with the club were too small for the interest and delight which he knows the members must share with him. The subjects set for the weekly sketch, the troubles with unruly stewards, the annual sale of the famous mugs, the adventures of a dog as unwelcome lodger, the making from nothing of the club's fine library, Abbey's "smiling white teeth," press notices of club functions, the flittings from house to house,—all these and many more are to him facts of the utmost importance; all have their place; all are treated with equal respect; and, no doubt, all are as welcome to his special audience.

The history of the club, however, is of interest to a larger public for a reason upon which we do not think Mr. Shelton lays sufficient stress. Throughout the ages there have been the same little reunions of young artists, the same meetings primarily for work in stimulating company, incidentally for the sort of gaiety youth loves. But, as a rule, they finish with the youth of their members. It is the rare exception when they strengthen and develop until they reach the present prosperity of the Salmagundi; and this is because few have had the chance that was the Salmagundi's of getting its start just at the right moment. Those first meetings at Jonathan Scott Hartley's studio, in which the comparatively imposing premises in Fifth Avenue had their origin, were held in the eighteen-seventies, the period to which art in America, especially illustration, owed a tremendous impetus. It was the decade of the Centennial, of the return of young enthusiasts from the schools of Munich and Paris, of the new life infused into our illustrated magazines, books, and papers. Nothing in American art is so wonderful as this development in illustration which made our magazines of the eighties and nineties models for the rest of the world. Many of the men who had much to do in helping to bring this development about were members of the Salmagundi,—Abbey, Howard Pyle, Reinhart, and Frost, among artists; A. W. Drake and Lewis Fraser, among editors. Black-and-white was to them the most serious form of art, worthy of hard work, endless experiment, constant endeavor, and not the mere makeshift, the convenient prop to an income, into which it has now degenerated. And the club shared their seriousness and enthusiasm. It held black-and-white exhibitions for a number of years, and so was a useful factor in the awakening of the outside and bewildered public to the fact that art does not begin and end with oil paint or marble and bronze. For this alone the Salmagundi Club must be remembered in any history of American art in the last century. Mr. Shelton devotes a chapter to these exhibitions, and refers to others and to many and different art interests of the club. But he hardly makes as much of the art as of the social side of the club, and has little to say of it in its relation to the influences and tendencies of the time. And now the Salmagundi has become almost altogether a social club, with its billiard room and card room and dining room and library, a "handsome oak room" sixty feet long, with rare editions and black-letter books on its shelves. And black-and-white, in books and magazines and papers, has fallen to depths lower than those from which it was rescued in the seventies. But it may be that somewhere, in some new version of the old Broadway studio, the young of our day are meeting to form another Salmagundi, under another name, and to instil new life into a dishonored art. For the more we change, the more we are the same.

The publishers have given an example, doubtless without meaning to, of the unfortunate methods of illustration in favor with the new generation. The drawings are printed with a yellow tint which destroys their value, in the case of the charcoal drawings leaving little but a black smudge; and they are inserted now upright, now sideways, and with no feeling for the balance of the page. Indeed, the volume, so attractive in its other details, would be a better piece of book-making had the illustrations been left out.

The Quenchless Spark

The Challenge to Sirius. By Sheila Kaye-Smith. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. $1.90.

The Great Hunger. By Johan Bojer. Translated from the Norwegian by W. J. Alexander Worster and C. Archer. New York: Moffat, Yard & Company. $1.60.

"IN the hushed velvet nights, when all was still save for the gurgle and lap of the water round his raft, he would lie and watch the great stars burn in the dim indigo above the trees. Lying there he would see all human endeavor and travail as a challenge to their remoteness—the wars and calamities of nations, the loves and sacrifices of men were so many challenges to Sirius, the great Indifference. Every human life was a challenge to Sirius. The remoteness of these Great Ones was being assailed, for men were finding that in their own breasts burned a spark of the fire that had set the stars alight." So, towards the close of Miss Kaye-Smith's long narrative, we are to hear its theme defined. Every human life a challenge: here, then, we need not look for a champion specially equipped for fray or high quest, the hero of high mien or lofty stature bound, after whatever untowardness of experience, for glory and conquest. By all conventional standards the Frank Rainger of the story is a failure. His father has been a failure before him, and a "quitter." Frank's distinction is that, in the fundamental things, he is not quite a quitter. He is incapable of deliberate baseness. For the rest, as the ditty has it, he doesn't know where he is going, but he keeps on his way. To keep going is in itself an objective—*the* objective, one would almost think, from this chronicler's point of view. "Carrying on" may be said to be the watchword of our time; to ask what for and what towards is an impertinence, if not an outrage. "The Challenge to Sirius" is a "life" story. It escorts a human being not quite from the cradle to the grave, but from a dreaming childhood to that hour when, past his middle years, the man (as much as ever he will) finds himself. The time is, roughly, from the thirties to the eighties of the Victorian century. The mood and atmosphere are oddly unlike what we commonly mean by "Victorian." When, some time after his father's suicide, young Frank Rainger charges upon London with his pen, Dickens and Thackeray are in their early prime. "Pendennis" is but recently out; but anything, unless for dress and whiskers, more unlike the "Pendennis" coterie than the scribbling crew with which Rainger is presently intimate, would be hard to imagine. For all their chat about Currer Bell and Borrow, Longfellow and "Uncle Tom's Cabin," we have the feeling that they are young twentieth century Chelseaites or Greenwichers amusing themselves in the costumes of their forbears. When Frank meets and admires a young writing Jewess, he is quite casually informed of her intelligent sympathy for rising men—instance the case of Frank's own room-mate, Irons: "She was his mistress for a couple of years, but now that's all fizzled out, and they're just capital friends." Frank, being from the country, says "Oh," and swallows hard in "outrage and disillusion." Nevertheless this very Rita Simons is presently installed as his own mistress and Egeria. Rita has no Victorian illusions, and takes occasion, in the midst of their early transports, to caution her lover that their relation is momentary. "What can divide

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us?" cries he. "Nothing—now," she answers, placidly. "When the time comes—anything. I want you to realize that, and to realize that it's best. Why should we insist on love being eternal? It isn't. It's a flash, a plunge, a stab—an experience you can repeat but not perpetuate." The signal for the end of their particular experience is the news of the marriage of Frank's rustic Maggie, back in the quiet Isle of Oxley. In late middle life he is at last to mate with that good, stupid, peasant woman. Meanwhile there are to be far adventures in love and war. The narrative is divided into six parts, or episodes. Over a third of the book is given, not wisely, to Part IV, a too circumstantial account of Frank's service in the Confederate army during the later years of our Civil War. In her descriptive passages (as in the opening sentences quoted above) this writer has often an extraordinary felicity, a sort of voluptuous fluency. Not for nothing has she made a special study of Galsworthy.

The motive of "The Great Hunger" is not dissimilar to that of "The Challenge to Sirius," but the atmosphere of the book is that of the clear, keen North, in contrast with the misty, scented, sluggish airs of Miss Kaye-Smith's work. In the boy Peer, illegitimate son of a good-natured town gentleman and a light woman, is mysteriously born the hunger for some ultimate good which shall justify his existence. At first it is a childish dream of self-assertion, yet even then not without its mingling of finer motives. He aspires to be a priest: "Not of your parsons with spectacles and pot belly: no, but a sort of heavenly messenger with snowy white robes and a face of glory. Perhaps some day he might even come so far that he could go down into that place of torment where his mother lay, and bring her up again, up to salvation. And when, in autumn evenings, he stood outside his palace, a white-haired bishop, he would lift up his finger, and all the stars should break into song." The little money his father leaves him will not fit him for the priesthood. He serves a hard apprenticeship to toil and poverty before he is able to enter a school of engineering. Then sorrow robs him of his faith in God, and he tries to worship science: "Where are you heading for, Peer? What are you aiming at in all your labors? And he would try to answer devoutly, as at evening prayers: Where? Why, of course, I am going to be a great engineer. And then? I will be one of the sons of Prometheus, that head the revolt against the tyranny of Heaven. And then? I will help to raise the great ladder on which men can climb aloft—higher and higher, up towards the light, and the spirit, and mastery over nature. And then? Live happily, marry and have children, and a rich and beautiful home. And then? Oh, well, one fine day, of course, one must grow old and die. And then? And then? Aye, what then?" So he becomes a great engineer, a man of fame—and in early middle life wearies of his work, for in this too he has lost faith. To the friend who reproaches him with giving up his post as a "missionary of civilization" he cries: "Culture! One wheel begets ten new ones. Brr-rr! And the ten again beget a hundred, Brr-rr-rr—more speed, more competition—and all for what? For culture? No, my friend, for money. Missionary! I tell you, as long as Western Europe with all its wonders of modern science and its Christianity hasn't turned out a better type of humanity than the mean ruck of men we have now—we'd do best to stay at home and hold our confounded jaw!" Then come love and happy marriage, the be-all for a time but not the end-all. For his own work calls him after a while, and now misfortunes dog him, and ruin of health and wealth, and at last the brutal slaying of his innocent child. And at the very nadir something is revealed to him—the existence in him and in his fellow-men of a single indomitable spark of will, of faith, of hunger to prevail: "Mankind must arise, and be better than the blind powers that order its ways; in the midst of its sorrows it must take heed that the god-like does not die. . . . It is man himself that must create the divine in heaven and on earth—and that is his triumph over the dead omnipotence of the universe." Thus nobly and affirmatively, in the second of these interpretations, is proclaimed that challenge which in the first has taken a relatively negative and inconclusive form.

Books in Brief

EVEN as late as the year 1914 the political ideals of the civilized world were not widely different from those of Plato. They were confined to the furtherance of justice, health, and happiness in individual states, which had, of course, as one of their primary duties that of their own defence against foreign enemies. Plato's republic was, in fact, Athens, and the true object of his investigations was to render Athens safe from troubles external and internal. He hoped to see Athens remodelled into his ideal republic; the notion of making the world safe for democracy or for anything else certainly never occurred to him. "The Republic" has within four years become hopelessly out of date as a political treatise. Therefore, at least from a political point of view, there is little timeliness in the appearance of Dr. Alexander Kerr's translation of that work (Chicago: C. H. Kerr Company; $2). But "The Republic" is, of course, much more than a political treatise. It is, in some sort, a drama—perhaps a poem; some parts of it are prose poetry at its best. But even so, it has been adequately translated by many scholars, and in English, perhaps definitively, by Jowett. So that even from an artistic point of view there seems little reason for a new version. To revert to the political aspect for a moment: to the Bolsheviki of Russia, of all people, has been ascribed—falsely, we believe,—a desire to experiment with Plato's proposal to communize women. The following quotation will give a fair idea of Dr. Kerr's style, and will serve as a reminder that the communization of women is not such a modern suggestion as some suppose it to be: "As a sequel to the last law and to those that preceded it, comes, as I think, another law to this effect. . . . That these women, with no exceptions, are to be the wives in common of all these men, and that none of them is to cohabit with one husband exclusively; and again that the children are to be common, and neither is the father to know his own child, nor the child his father." Plato was a militarist, and to him the soldier was almost, if not quite, the most important person in the state. Therefore, that the military strain may be kept up to a high standard, he suggests that those young men "who shall have signalized themselves by deeds of war or sundry public services, in addition to receiving other rewards and privileges, must have greater freedom of intercourse with women, in order that, their bravery serving as a pretext, such fathers may have the greatest number of children." As a work of art, "The Republic" will always be read, preferably in the original—which is true of all literary works of art. But no one hereafter will read it for its political content. In that respect it has had its day.

PERHAPS the most obvious comment upon Montrose J. Moses's "Representative British Drama, Victorian and Modern" (Little, Brown; $4) is that the title is somewhat misleading. It contains sixteen plays, selected as fairly illustrative of the changes, in character and methods, of the English dramatic product during a period of ninety years, from 1820 to 1910. Manifestly the samples are necessarily insufficient to fulfil more than a small part of their intimated purpose. They mark high points of individual achievement, in different decades, and in various directions—not all new by any means—but have comparatively little significance as a demonstration of the processes of dramatic development, of progress or retrogression. This was inevitable, and although the selected plays all have a definite excellence of their own, and form a convenient anthology for casual readers of drama, the collection can scarcely be called valuable, or, except in a rather limited sense, representative. The list begins with the "Virginius" of Sheridan Knowles, which is fairly representative of its period and is generally accepted as a minor classic. The choice of it has ample justification. Not many critics would say as much in the case of "Black Ey'd Susan" or "London Assurance." "Richelieu," chiefly owing to the acting of Macready, Phelps, Edwin Booth, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry Irving, is perhaps the best known of Lytton's plays, but it is at least open to question whether as representative English drama the palm ought not to be accorded to "Money." On literary grounds alone "Becket" and "A Blot in the 'Scutcheon" have every right to inclusion. Both are noble works. But why "The Ticket of Leave Man" to the exclusion of "Masks and Faces" and Charles Reade? It may seem churlish to challenge the right of the brilliant and delightful "Pinafore" to appear in this category, but surely it is not drama or fairly representative of the best of W. S. Gilbert. Henry Arthur Jones is well represented by "The Masqueraders," though in his prolific output there is more than one comedy of equal brilliance. Here, as in the case of Oscar Wilde, who was more of the epigrammatist than dramatist, the choice was difficult, though for very different reasons. "The Gay Lord Quex" is undoubtedly a good example of Pinero's extraordinarily adroit stagecraft, but "The Thunderbolt" is a more notable dramatic achievement. "The Silver Box," again, is no bad specimen of Galsworthy, but there are not a few of his admirers who would put both "The Pigeon" and "The Fugitive" before it. St. John Hankin's "The Cassilis Engagement" is a glittering bit of light comedy, but his more solid ability is displayed to better advantage in "The Last of the De Mullins." "The Madras House" of Granville Barker is so largely an exposition of somewhat outworn social theories, with confirmatory incidents specially devised, and is so destitute of dramatic result, that it has not much except its literary cleverness to commend it. The "Pompey the Great" of John Masefield is a work well worthy of its place, on account of its originality and distinctive power of invention, though it is more adapted to the library than the stage. Besides the English plays Mr. Moses reprints five examples of the new Irish drama. Three of them, the "Cathleen ni Hoolihan" of Yeats, the "Riders to the Sea" of John M. Synge, and Dunsany's "Gods of the Mountain," would dignify any collection, but "The Workhouse Ward" of Lady Gregory is in no way remarkable, even as broad farce.

CONTEMPORARY discussion of plans for a league of nations has created a sudden interest in earlier strivings toward international government. Already a number of historical surveys have found their way into print. In his "Experiments in International Administration" (Harper; $1.50), Mr. Francis Bowes Sayre has made it his task to collect, classify, and briefly describe the many international agreements and organizations of the past hundred years that have involved actual administrative machinery and responsibility. To an extent, this has meant to duplicate the work done by Dr. Reinsch in his "Public International Unions," published in 1911. But Mr. Sayre's little volume covers the field with a completeness to which Dr. Reinsch's book makes no pretension; and it naturally stresses those problems and experiences which have most obvious relation to the present league-of-nations question. International executive organs are arranged in three classes: first, those with little or no real power of control; second, those with real power of control over some local situation within a particular state or states; and third, those with real power of control over all of the member states themselves. An example of the first type is the International Postal Union; of the second, the Suez Canal Commission; of the third, the International Sugar Commission. After an analytical chapter on each of these types, the author presents certain conclusions, chiefly (1) that while very few international executive organs with power have proved successful, the reason lies not in any inherent impossibilities in international government, but in the fact that nations have commonly been unwilling to accord the proper amount of power to an international body; (2) that no scheme of international government can ever go far unless the principle of unanimity is replaced by that of majority rule, as has already been done in the International Sugar Commission; (3) that the notion must be abandoned that all states, great and small, are entitled to precisely the same amount of influence in shaping the public affairs and political destinies of the world; (4) that a league of nations, to be enduring, must be based upon nationality, self-government, and other principles of justice, and must have a sanction consisting of more than mere mutual guarantees; and (5) that the hard necessities of the situation in which the civilized world now finds itself can be counted upon to "evolve a successful and triumphant league of nations." The book is adequately documented; but one wonders why the publishers have reverted to the antiquated and exasperating practice of grouping at the chapter-ends the citations of authorities and other notes which ought to have been distributed through the pages.

THE adjective stupendous might without gross exaggeration be applied to that ponderous but admirable example of cumulative book-listing, "The United States Catalog" (H. W. Wilson Co.; $48) for 1912-17, which gathers into one alphabetical arrangement, under authors, titles, and subjects, all the entries contained in the annual issues of the "Cumulative Book Index" for the years indicated, with a few additional items there omitted. It is a weighty quarto of 2,298 pages, published in a limited edition of numbered copies, and constituting, in name as well as in fact, a supplement to the similarly entitled catalogue of 1912. Even pamphlets and society publications, and such nondescript products of the press as Darius Hadley's "Arithmetical Tables for the Use of Teachers," in the form of six separate cards, are scrupulously recorded by the painstaking compilers, whose names, so far as the title-page reveals them, are Marion E. Potter, Emma L. Teich, and Louise Teich. In addition to a full bibliographical description of each item listed, the Library of Congress card order number is given whenever such card is procurable, and occasional notes are appended. Out-of-print books are designated by the initials o. p. There are abundant cross references, so that a book only vaguely known to the inquirer will in most instances be traceable; and the marshaling of these multifarious entries in one alphabetical list, instead of several classified lists, renders even inexpert consultation as little puzzling as possible. In short, the virtues of the cumulative system are here displayed to the best advantage, and probably no other method could have so successfully and expeditiously coped with the mechanical difficulties of the task assigned. The extent of this task will be more fully appreciated when it is added that the mere list of publishers whose works are catalogued covers twelve fine-print pages of three columns each. And now, to temper praise with criticism, let us note one or two failings, slight though they may be. In the use of heavy and less heavy type there appears, as one turns the pages, no clear and logical rule, perhaps owing partly to faults of presswork or to other technical causes mysterious to the non-printer. Again, though the prefixed list of abbreviations intimates in advance that imported works are to be designated by "imp," no such designation appears to be assigned to the ordinary English-made book offered for sale by an American publisher and bearing his imprint. Yet these works are commonly regarded as importations by the trade, and are spoken of as such. On the whole, this voluminous work is manifestly the product of untiring industry and infinite pains.

THE topics dealt with in M. Edmond Perrier's interesting and instructive book, "La Vie en Action" (Paris: Flammarion), all fall within the sphere of what used to be called natural philosophy. They owe what interrelation they possess partly to the fact that most of them are concerned with the narrower province of biology, and partly, as the author remarks in his preface, to the fundamental unity of science, which is ever progressively impressed on us with every increase in our stock of scientific knowledge. M. Perrier's subjects range all the way from the origin and evolution of the world and its inhabitants to the phenomena of spiritualism. They are often intrinsically difficult, but their difficulty is materially mitigated by the author's skill in exposition, his breezy style, and his constant flashes of wit and humor. Thus, for example, in the chapter headed, "The R-less Months, Oysters, and the Male

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sex," the useful is happily blended with the entertaining, when a discussion of the difficult question of sex-determination in the oyster is pleasantly introduced by a semi-jocular disquisition on the powers of the human stomach to digest the bivalve in or out of season. Again, in his chapter on the rather dreary subject of "Alcohol and Alcoholism," M. Perrier sets forth with scientific exactitude the case against alcohol, not only from the point of view of the alcoholic, but also from that of those whom Dr. Roubinovitch picturesquely calls "les enfants du dimanche" —"tristes produits," our author observes, "d'une inspiration trouvée au fond de quelque bouteille de vieux rhum, de vieux cognac, ou pis encore." Of absinthe he remarks that at least one standard beverage which used to be sold under that name contained a dozen or more drugs, and he adds pleasantly: "On peut, paraît-il, ne pas mettre d'absinthe dans cet affreux breuvage; en revanche, la badiane et la tanaisie, essentiellement dangereuses, ne manquent jamais."

WE are glad to note the publication of a third edition of Henri Lambert's "Pax Economica" (Boston: International Free Trade League; 75 cents). The articles and open letters which make up the book have appeared, during the course of the war, in the *Journal des Economistes*, the Manchester *Guardian*, the New York *Evening Post*, and other periodicals and journals. It is noteworthy that a Belgian manufacturer, a man who was practically driven out of his home and his business by the German invasion, could from the beginning preserve so sane and vivid a vision of the only permanent peace. M. Lambert's position renders the more telling his arguments in favor of a system to which the class to which he belongs has always been hostile. With the fabric of his personal life and the life of his nation falling to pieces, he boldly insists upon the necessity for inviting the enemy to a conference, for rejecting the spoils system in any event, and for defining economy in human rather than in narrowly national terms. Throughout his book M. Lambert argues against the fallacies of protectionism, denouncing it as "a system of robbery and impoverishment of the masses of consumers for the benefit of the privileged minorities of producers." The arguments he advances are sound, though it may seem to some readers that the writer is too preoccupied with the ethical aspect of the question. A lesser reliance on man's intrinsic morality and a more frequent advancement of statistical evidence would give the book a more scholarly character. That M. Lambert is primarily interested in an economic peace is, however, patent when he reiterates that only such a peace will lead to disarmament—that freedom of trade is the *sine qua non* of freedom of the seas.

NO really great contribution to the literature of flying will be made until the perspective of time has mellowed experience, and the novel sensations have found new phraseology in which adequately to clothe themselves. All that is possible in descriptions written day by day is to chronicle details of routine and to search for ready-made similes for these (literally) unearthly manœuvres. Lieutenant Briggs Kilburn Adams's letters, now reprinted in a volume entitled "The American Spirit" (Atlantic Monthly Press; $1.50), have done these things with a virility of diction and a delicacy of imagination which place them well in the forefront of the great mass of similar war narratives. The writer has succeeded all the better, probably, because his letters deal with the preparation and training and not at all with the fighting. Thus the confusion and magnitude of the actual great adventure which renders most of us so inarticulate did not enter to hinder the sheer emotion which flying arouses. Certainly no better descriptions of the beginner's feelings have yet been chronicled, and no more beautifully-worded letters, revealing the best type of young American—a true gentle-man. Lieutenant Adams was an officer in the Royal Flying Corps. On March 14, 1918, he was found dead in his airplane in a French field, whether brought down by an enemy projectile or by an accident is not known.

AMONG the activities of the American-Scandinavian Foundation perhaps the most important is the publication in English translation of a series of "Scandinavian Classics," representative works of Holberg, Strindberg, Björnson, J. P. Jacobsen, and others. The latest author to be represented in the series is Selma Lagerlöf, whose masterpiece, "Gösta Berling's Saga," is now published by the Foundation in two handsomely printed volumes ($3). The edition is based on Lillie Tudeer's translation, first published in England in 1894; this has been carefully revised, and on certain points corrected, by Hanna Astrup Larsen, of the editorial staff of the Foundation. In preparing her version of the "Saga," Miss Tudeer omitted a considerable portion of the romance; this part, eight chapters in all, has been restored in the present edition, in a translation by Velma Swanston Howard, well known as a translator of Swedish classics in verse as well as in prose. Notable features of the publication are a map of the Löfven district in Värmland, where the scenes of the romance are laid, and a bibliography of the works of Selma Lagerlöf prepared by G. N. Swan. The latter includes titles in ten languages, and proves that the strange and the wierd and the fanciful still appeal strongly to lovers of literary art.

THE latest of several posthumous volumes compiled from the writings of John Muir is entitled "Steep Trails" (Houghton; $3), and consists of twenty-four essays which originally appeared as letters or as articles in obscure publications of limited circulation. They span a period of twenty-nine years of the author's life, and are of varied degrees of excellence. It is impossible to offer any detailed criticism of such a heterogeneous anthology, but to the many lovers of John Muir and his writings none is required. The very brevity of some of the chapters has seemed to result in an increased pithiness and aptness of simile. On opening the volume one's eye is caught by these lines: "Other tourists never leave the trail, content with the window views, and cling to the comforts of the sleeping-car like blind mice to their mothers." The essays begin with a paper on the mountain sheep, and end with an almost adequate appreciation of the Grand Cañon. Between, we find visualized the splendid scenery of Shasta and Ranier, the Nevada desert, Utah, and San Gabriel Mountains, and we re-live with Muir his stirring adventures amidst those scenes. America may well be proud of this poetic mountaineer, this philosopher of the hills. As in the case of the previous volumes of Muir's posthumous writings, the publishers have given "Steep Trails" an exceptionally satisfactory setting.

JOHN REED'S

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD

($2.00) will be published a week from today, also

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

($1.00) by **Major Walter Guest Kellogg,** with a really illuminative introduction by **Sec. of War, Newton D. Baker.** They can be bought at any bookstore or direct from us. Send for our spring catalog.

MEN IN WAR ($1.50) has recently been released by the Post Office Department

BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y.

Publishers of the Modern Library

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

The Psychology of Burlesque

REAL burlesque is a rare visitor on Broadway. Its place is filled by extravagant farce and its name travestied in particularly vulgar comic opera. Strictly speaking, burlesque is a comic exaggeration of an art form. It is the author talking shop, or rather laughing shop, giving us a peep behind the scenes, showing us how it is done and what fools these authors be! It is half sister to satire and first cousin to caricature but it is neither. Satire and caricature deal with the original material, burlesque with the reproduction. Moreover, satire carries a sting and caricature concentrates on eccentricities; burlesque is a candid, genial form. From its nature it implies a knowledge of its subject, a standard of criticism, an artistic ideal, and a sense of humor. No wonder it is rare. Also its appeal is intellectual and æsthetic rather than emotional. It must therefore be used on the stage with discrimination and properly adulterated for general consumption. No American audience should be expected to entertain itself a whole evening through its intellect.

Burlesque in "the movies" is a particularly dangerous experiment. James Montgomery Flagg has tried it, and, we fear, prematurely. For the appreciation of burlesque implies a degree of sophistication lacking in all but the most cosmopolitan movie audiences. The other night we had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Flagg's "Fiendish Flannagan" at a small picture house in the outskirts of Washington. We regret to report that almost the only laughter in the hall was our own. Fiendish Flannagan's horrible character was due to his inability to roll cigarettes with one hand after the manner of the approved movie desperado. This early failure had warped his whole nature. He is introduced to us as a man without a conscience. He shoots on sight; he does not wait for the formality of a provocation. He has such a fiery eye he burns up an offensive placard merely by looking at it. The terror of his glance turns Dirk Mendez grey in a single moment and poor Dirk would never have come out of the film alive if he hadn't gone east and thrown himself on the mercy of the author. "Ain't it queer!" said the woman on our left, and "What's it all about?" inquired the youngster behind us.

The best known exponent of burlesque writing for the stage to-day is, of course, George M. Cohan. Mr. Cohan, born and bred in the shadow of the theatre, is so much of it, he cannot resist introducing a little shop talk into all his work, and often it is more than a little. For he knows just how to mix his brew into a commercial commodity and he uses the form with skill though without subtlety. A "Cohan Revue" has all the allurements of a comic opera and infinitely more flavor. In "The Royal Vagabond," a present offering, Mr. Cohan has evidently redeemed a trite sentimental operetta from failure by turning the triteness into burlesque and keeping the sentimentality. The singers stop making fun of comic opera just long enough for their romantic ditties to be sung and encored. Thus the emotional appeal is sustained, without which all the props of music, pageant, and dance would be insufficient to keep the play on the road of popular success. For burlesque cannot stand alone; it is a parasite. Complete dramatic burlesque like "The Critic" and "The Rehearsal" have a limited and special appeal.

But burlesque introduced carefully into comedy adds a piquant tang. It is the secret of Mrs. Fiske's comic method. Her comedies always become partial burlesque whether or no it was the original intention of the author. Mrs. Fiske is constantly outside her part as well as in it. We feel her intellectual appreciation of the rôle even more than her emotional sympathy with it. She never loses herself in a comedy characterization as, for example, Laura Hope Crewes did in her exquisite portrayal of the wife in "The Saving Grace," or in "Her Husband's Wife," or half a dozen rôles we might mention. Miss Crewes is past master of pure comedy, Mrs. Fiske of high burlesque. Indeed one sometimes questions whether we enjoy Mrs. Fiske's impersonation as much as enjoy her own enjoyment of that impersonation. It is an infectious mirth. In "Miss Nelly o' N'Orleans" she runs the gamut of burlesque subtly. Her delicate burlesque of heroic acting, romantic acting, comic acting, and the spirit back of all three, makes of "Miss Nelly" a perpetual delight.

It is often impossible to separate the author's and the actor's contribution to dramatic burlesque, but it is worth noting that when properly used it always adds to the sympathetic quality of the character. Apply it to an unsympathetic character and you render the character sympathetic. There is something ingratiating in the method. It establishes a secret entente between the actor and the audience of which the character reaps the benefit.

We welcome burlesque to our stage even in its simplest form, for it demands a certain amount of cultivation in the audience, and it implies a bit of divine discontent. When we make fun of an art form we are usually inspired by the fact that the form of the art has become more important than the content. Burlesque is the common sense of genius. Shakespeare burlesqued his contemporaries constantly. Despite frequent attempts, we have not yet successfully burlesqued Shakespeare. His is too balanced and sane a genius, as well as too rich a one, to give the burlesquer an opening. Burlesque is the check on excess and mannerism, the revealer of emptiness and unreality. The more we get of it the better for the future of our drama.

THERESA HELBURN

Art

War Records

GRIM war—the war of blood and horror, grime and devastation, pain and squalor—is in S. J. Woolf's paintings, sketches, and drawings recently shown at the Milch Galleries. He was at the front, he saw for himself, he stated what he saw with a truth that makes itself felt. But the record of fact seems to have left him little time, or perhaps inclination, for the poetry of paint. His preoccupation was with the blood oozing from the mouth of the sniper caught in the branches of his high tree, the horrid birds hovering near, quick to scent their prey; with the contortions of the agonized bodies as "the dawn's early light" reveals them held fast in the wire entanglements; with the mangled arm of the man on the operating table; with the sullen march of prisoners;—with all that makes war hideous and revolting. Only here and there are the qualities that appeal to the artist emphasized, as in "The Night Attack," which suggests the strange, sombre beauty of the blue heavens afire with star-like shells, and the shadowy earth filled with ghostly figures, or "The Night March," which so well expresses the movement of troops along the vaguely indicated road. It is curious that, in this case, the finished painting improves upon the little sketch for it. It seems as if Woolf, in the interval between jotting down his first impression and working it out in the studio, had studied Raffet's prints, so like is the leading figure in the painting to that great leader whom Raffet's armies followed ever, even while they grumbled. Woolf's drawings, with portraits of Joffre and some others, are interesting.

Frenchmen like Forain and Steinlen, however, never forget that they are artists, even in the face of events almost beyond the reach of art. That is why Mr. Gallatin's collection of their prints, shown in the Arden Gallery, was of such artistic importance. Their war prints and posters cannot be seen too often, helping as they do to set the standard. Their impressiveness was heightened by the inclusion in the exhibit of some of the earlier work of both artists—work taking us back to the days that now seem so immensely remote when the slim Yvette Guilbert wore her long black gloves and Aristide Bruant sang his songs at the Mirliton, when Forain laughed at the follies of Paris and all Paris laughed with him.

N. N.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

Savings and Federal Reserve System

MUCH interest has been excited by the action of the American Bankers' Association in advocating the entrance of the savings banks into the Federal Reserve System. The proposal is to amend the Federal Reserve Act so as to admit the savings banks to membership and place them in a position where the highly valuable rediscount privilege, available for member banks, may be accorded them.

This move is of the highest importance to the 12,000,000 savings-bank depositors of the United States. The Committee on Liquid Investments of the savings-bank section of the American Bankers' Association have urged amendments to the laws of Connecticut, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, giving the savings banks authority to invest in bankers' acceptances and trade acceptances when endorsed by a bank or trust company which is a member of the Federal Reserve System. Should the State laws be amended in this way and if Congress acts favorably upon the proposal to admit the savings banks to the Federal Reserve Bank System, the savings banks would provide a broad market for bankers and trade acceptances. Another advantage would be the protection afforded the savings-banks against runs and the minor disturbances incident to a period of industrial unrest or depression. The savings banks have rendered an extraordinary service to the country and there is no doubt but that they will play an even greater part after this in the promotion of savings campaigns. In the nature of things, however, these institutions are forced to invest most of their money in securities of a type which are not readily marketable. By holding high-grade real estate mortgages and first lien bonds, these institutions have provided unusual safeguards for the thrifty savings depositor.

The New York State law has been amended so as to permit savings banks to invest a certain proportion of their money in high-grade acceptances. Some banks have already taken advantage of this change in the law and have strengthened their position accordingly. There are times when the highest grade securities are the most difficult to realize upon in an over-burdened security market. The War Finance Corporation is permitted to make advances to savings banks under certain conditions, but the regulations are such as to make it rather difficult for the savings banks to apply for this relief, except at a time of panic.

There is no reason why the savings banks should not be permitted to join the Federal Reserve System, just as the State banks and trust companies are. Although mutual banks have no capital stock, the law could be easily changed, so as to admit the savings banks upon other terms. If this should be done in the near future, it would safeguard the savings banks in a remarkable way.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

The American Language

A Preliminary Inquiry Into the Development of English in the U. S.

By H. L. MENCKEN

This is the first comprehensive study of the subject since Schele de Vere's "Americanisms: the English of the New World" (1872). Not a dictionary of Americanisms, but an attempt to investigate the lines of growth of the language in America. It embraces, among other things, the first serious inquiry into the grammar of colloquial American ever made, American spelling, the influence of immigrant languages upon English in America, and the mutations of American surnames and other proper names. Bibliography and full indices.

The edition, consisting of only 1500 numbered copies, has been printed from type. IX + 394 pages; bound in blue buckram with gilt lettering; $4.00 net. A descriptive circular with table of contents may be had upon request to the publisher.

For sale at all bookshops or postpaid from the publisher on receipt of published price plus 5% additional for postage.

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West Forty-Second St., New York

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

"A. E." The Candle of Vision. Macmillan. $1.60.
Cunliffe, John W. English Literature During the Last Half Century. Macmillan. $2.
Russell, George W. E. Prime Ministers and Some Others. Scribners. $4.
Wood, Butler, editor. Charlotte Brontë: A Centenary Memorial. Dutton. $4.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Archer, William. The Peace-President. Holt. $1.
Baldwin, Simeon E. Life and Letters of Simeon Baldwin. New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Co. $3.50.
Henschel, George. Musings and Memories of a Musician. Macmillan. $5.
Huxley, Leonard. Life and Letters of Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker. Appleton. $12.
Lee, Elizabeth. Wives of the Prime Ministers. Dutton. $5.
Rogers, Henry M., editor. Annals of the Commandery of the State of Massachusetts. Boston: Atlantic Printing Co.
Sweet, William W. A History of Latin America. Abingdon Press. $3.

FICTION

Bailey, Temple. The Tin Soldier. Penn Publishing Co. $1.50.
Connor, Ralph. The Sky Pilot in No Man's Land. Doran. $1.50.
Dixon, Thomas. The Way of a Man. Appleton. $1.50.
Ibáñez, Vincente B. The Cabin. Knopf. $1.50.
MacFarlan, Alexander. Mockery. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.60.
O'Brien, Edward J., editor. The Best Short Stories of 1918. Small, Maynard. $1.60.
Summers, Florence E. Dere Bill. Stokes. 75 cents.
Wallace, Edgar. Tam o' the Scoots. Small, Maynard. $1.35.
Welles, Harriet. Anchors Aweigh. Scribners. $1.50.

THE WAR

Barron, Clarence W. War Finance. Houghton. $1.50.
Egan, Maurice F. Ten Years Near the German Frontier. Doran. $3.
Garnett, Edward. Papa's War, and Other Satires. London: George Allen & Unwin.
Long, Robert C. Russian Revolution Aspects. Dutton. $2.50.
Morel, E. D. Truth and the War. London: National Labour Press.
Simons, A. M. The Vision for Which We Fought. Macmillan. $1.50.

Every Book

advertised in this magazine (with possibly a few exceptions) is to be had on its day of publication at

Brentano's

Book Store

PROMPT ATTENTION GIVEN ALL MAIL ORDERS

Broadway at Ninth Street

NEW YORK AND IN PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Peace President

By WILLIAM ARCHER

An English estimate of President Wilson which considers him as a man, a writer, an historian, a politician, and as the great figure of the final phase of the world war and the peace settlement.

Just ready, $1.00 net

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York City

The Scandinavian Art Shop

Carl Larsson interior Peasant furniture. Northern needlework, porcelains and prints of various kinds, etchings, lithographs, woodcuts. We are fortunate in possessing a number of the inimitable Bland Tomtar och Troll of the late John Bauer which we are offering for sale at reasonable prices. Also some fine color prints by Carl Larsson and Bruno Liljefors.

728 Madison Avenue - New York

New Fallacies of Midas

By C. E. ROBINSON

Author of "In the Days of Alkibiades." With a preface by Sir George Paish. Post free 6s6d.

A series of critical essays on the present economic organization of society, written with a view to making clearer to the lay reader what will be the true function of the Capitalist in the new era in view of the advancing tide of Socialism and Syndicalism.

Labour in the Commonwealth

By G. D. H. COLE, M. A. Post free 5s 11d

Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Author of "The World of Labour," "Labour in War-time," "Self-government in Industry," etc.

Those who wish to understand the spirit and faith of this generation of economic investigators (which it is interesting to compare with those of the Benthamites, the Christian Socialists, the Positivists, and the Fabians of the last century), must read this volume—perhaps the best that Mr. Cole has yet written. Very instructive is Mr. Cole's exposition of the essential humanity of what economists and employers persist in thinking of as "Labour"; very interesting is his analysis of the State as only one out of many communities of which we simultaneously form parts, and not necessarily the most important of them."—*The New Statesman.*

May we mail you a copy of our Spring List of Publications?

Headley Bros., *Publishers*, Ltd.

72 Oxford Street London, England

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY *of* CALIFORNIA

Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.

List of titles and prices free on request.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

DEMOCRACY IN RECONSTRUCTION

Authoritative Discussions of AFTER-WAR Problems

EDITED BY

Frederick A. Cleveland
Formerly Chairman of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency.

and

Joseph Schafer
Professor of History, University of Oregon, Vice-Chairman of the National Board for Historical Service.

Ready in March

CONTENTS

The Historical Background of Reconstruction in America
By JOSEPH SCHAFER

Ideals of Democracy
FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND
W. W. WILLOUGHBY

Institutions of Democracy
CARL KELSEY
ARTHUR JAMES TODD
EDWARD CARY HAYES
W. F. WILLOUGHBY

After-War Labor Problems
HAROLD G. MOULTON
WILLIAM F. OGBURN

After-War Social Problems
ESTHER CLAYSON LOVEJOY, M. D.
MARY ELIZABETH TITZEL
CHARLES R. MANN and SAMUEL CAPEN
WILLIS H. CAROTHERS

After-War Transportation Problems
FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND
ROBERT C. HARGREAVES
Statement of the Interstate Commerce Commission
WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH

After-War Political Problems
CHESTER COLLINS MAXEY
FREDERIC C. YOUNG

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston, New York, Chicago

Not a single copy of

The Nation

of

DECEMBER 28, 1918
JANUARY 4, 1919
JANUARY 11, 1919

is left in this office. And we still continue to have daily requests for these particular issues.

If you have any of these numbers that you care to part with, the Circulation Department of The Nation will welcome their return. We would not trouble you with this request had we not already exhausted every possible source of supply.

We will gladly pay ten cents, plus the postage, for every copy.

AMERICA in FRANCE

The One Book that tells the story of the American Army in France

By MAJOR FREDERICK PALMER
of General Pershing's Staff
$2.00

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY
Publishers New York

The NATION is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations which regularly audits and attests all figures given. **A.B.C.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1919 No. 2781

Freedom of the Seas—A Compromise

By EDWARD S. CORWIN

"Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants."—*The second of President Wilson's fourteen points.*

IN undertaking in his recent speech at Dewsbury to interpret President Wilson's second point, Viscount Grey offered the suggestion that "what is in the President's mind is that freedom of the seas should be secured to any nation observing the covenants of a league of nations, and should be denied to any nation breaking those covenants." "If that is so," he continued, "then a league of nations is the solution to the whole question and cannot be discussed apart from it."

It seems to me that these words probe very close to the heart of the President's intention. His vision of a league of nations has been, pretty clearly, that of an international agency vested with authority to determine conclusively all international controversies, so that any nation rejecting a decision of the league would find itself in a situation approximating outlawry. But, fortunately or unfortunately, by the standard set by any such sweeping proposal the fight for a league of nations has already been lost. Speaking broadly—though with essential accuracy—the tentative covenant of the league of nations obliges the contracting parties to accept an international determination of their controversies with one another only in cases in which arbitration has been accepted by both disputants, or in cases in which the Executive Council of the league is able to arrive at a unanimous recommendation, the parties to the dispute not being counted. This is not to say, of course, that the proposed league is valueless. On the contrary, if it can but survive, it will have distinct value in providing an expected procedure in the sifting of international misunderstandings, so that the nation which refuses to follow this procedure will at once designate itself as the aggressor. Also, this procedure will create delay, the *ultima ratio* will be really ultimate, not penultimate or antepenultimate, as Germany made it in 1914. Still the main point is that by the theory of the league itself there may still be wars, and quite legitimate wars, which means that the question of the scope to be allowed naval power in such contests has to be faced. Thus, while Viscount Grey is right in contending that the two problems of a league of nations and freedom of the seas are not to be dissevered, he is right for a reason overlooked by himself. This reason is that there *can be no successful league of nations the decisions of which are liable to perversion by the obvious menace of too readily available force lodged with a single great Power.*

The limits of naval power are two: the actual forces at hand—ships, armament, and men; and the rules of law defining the legitimate use of these forces against an enemy. The problem of naval disarmament is a phase of the broader problem of freedom of the seas which must be solved primarily in the light of Great Britain's peculiar needs. The British contend, and rightly, that the security of the British Empire from invasion is dependent upon British predominance at sea; and they very justifiably argue that they ought not to be required to surrender this source of security in reliance upon so experimental an affair as the league of nations must long remain. But does this argument rule out altogether the idea of naval disarmament? A proportionate curtailment both of building programmes and of existing establishments would still leave Great Britain the relative supremacy she enjoys to-day, while any reduction at all would diminish the danger and consequent discontent which must arise from an undue predominance of naval power in the league of nations. Certainly, if there is one thing which a war-worn and well-nigh bankrupt world is demanding to-day, it is that the previous intolerable standards of international competition in armaments be abandoned. Unless this is done, the mass of mankind will be disposed to regard the league of nations, whatever form it assumes, as a good deal of a sham.

Far more complex are the facts to be taken into account in any attempt to reformulate at this moment the rules of naval warfare; and, indeed, what is here put forward is offered merely with the idea of furnishing a fillip to discussion. Some of the objections that are likely to be forthcoming against an effort of this sort should, however, be squarely confronted.

Thus, we hear it said that in a future world war the same thing would happen that has happened in this, namely, that all rules would go by the board. Very likely this is so; but then all wars are not world wars, and indeed, one of the main purposes of the league of nations will be the localization of wars which it cannot prevent. The century stretching from the Congress of Vienna to the murder of the Austrian Archduke saw many wars, but in all of them the neutral interests preponderated, there was eager competition between the belligerent parties for mutual approval and sympathy, and the rules of warfare, particularly where they supported neutral interests, were generally regarded.

Nor, again, should the valiant *non possumus* of certain English statesmen, like Mr. Winston Churchill, be treated too seriously in this connection, for there are other Englishmen—those, for instance, for whom the *Manchester Guardian* and the London *Nation* speak—who hold that, in view of the undeveloped potentialities of the submarine and the aeroplane as weapons of naval warfare, England, seabound and dependent almost from day to day upon the flow of supplies from across water, has a more vital interest than any other state in seeing the rules of naval warfare recast. Also, the argument that is so frequently drawn from the reputation of British statesmanship for moderation should

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not trouble us too much. No doubt this moderation will welcome the opportunity to make reasonable concessions in the very matter before us.

Still, it will be argued that any rules which we may suggest will be artificial, especially since, as the present war has shown, warfare is to-day an affair not of Governments simply but also of peoples; with the result that in belligerent countries the line marking off the private from the public interest speedily disappears. Obviously, this argument overshoots the mark, going even to the extent of justifying the whole German theory of *Schrecklichkeit*, for all rules restrictive of belligerent rights are in a sense artificial; the great question is, are they desirable in themselves and can they command a support that will make their observance fairly probable?

The major results to be sought in a recasting of the rules of naval warfare are, it seems to me, fairly clear from the point of view of the idea of a world organized for peace. One such result has just been indicated. Inasmuch as it will be necessary still to leave weapons of defence with individual nations, every effort must be made to blunt these weapons for aggressive uses; and since a predominant naval force must be left with Great Britain for her security, if this problem is to be solved with respect to naval power the solution must appear in large part in the rules of naval warfare. Certain other *desiderata* are hardly less evident: naval warfare must be rid forever of the atrocities which characterized German submarine warfare; so far as possible the interests of commerce must be preferred to those of war on the common highway of nations; lastly, the rules laid down must enlist a substantial neutral interest to back them up.

With these tests in mind, let us consider briefly the following concrete suggestions:

(1) For purposes of defence, the jurisdiction of littoral states should be extended over the adjoining sea for several marine leagues, and the planting of mines outside the waters thus brought under the control of belligerent states should be absolutely prohibited.

(2) The destruction of merchant vessels at sea should be unconditionally prohibited; a rule which, among other things, would prevent England from ever being successfully blockaded by submarines or aircraft.

(3) The belligerent right to capture enemy vessels and enemy goods aboard such vessels should be retained, but the allowance should be accompanied by a provision laying the so-called Rule of 1756 definitely at rest. By this rule, which has never received the assent of other nations, Great Britain has sought in the past to prevent neutrals from engaging, in war-time, in any branch of trade with an enemy which was closed to them in the previous era of peace. Even the English writer Hall, a great stickler for "British rights," admits that the rule is hardly defensible theoretically; and it is certain that no other practice lends more support to the contention that superior naval power is a species of blackmail, in that states which wield it always have the overseas commerce of other states at their mercy. There is obvious reason in permitting a belligerent to expel its enemy's shipping from the seas; there is no reason for permitting this act to carry with it the entire prostration of the enemy's sea-borne trade with neutrals. Indeed, closely scrutinized, the Rule of 1756 is violative of the Declaration of Paris, if not of its letter, certainly of its spirit.

(4) The belligerent right of blockade must be brought back to its former limits; that is to say, it must be confined strictly to enemy coasts and ports. The British embargo, of course, set this ancient principle entirely aside, and all goods destined to Germany by way of neutral ports or passing from Germany through neutral ports were subjected to capture. British propaganda represents the embargo as having been a potent cause of Germany's downfall, and it is not necessary to challenge this view, since whatever measure of importance be accorded it in this connection was due to a concomitance of circumstances which is not likely ever to occur again. With Russia neutral or an ally of Germany, the embargo would have been ineffective from the outset; had not Germany transgressed neutral rights much more outrageously, neutral states would scarcely have tolerated it. Certainly England cannot expect the world to consent that she should hold its sea-borne trade in fee, which, however, is what legalizing the embargo would mean.

(5) By the same sign, the distended and unworkable doctrine of contraband must be thrown overboard, as England herself proposed at the second Hague Conference; but at the same time neutral Governments should be put under obligation to forbid all trade in munitions and in certain of their ingredients. Under a régime of competitive armaments the munitions trade was a thing to be expected, and, as against a nation which had thought to overwhelm the rest of the world by its superior preparedness, it was highly desirable as well. A régime of disarmament, on the other hand, will place this species of traffic in a very different light, if indeed it does not ban the private production of munitions altogether. Nor should we in this connection ignore the interests of the new states of Central Europe. For the league of nations to leave these communities the prey of the Krupps and others of that ilk would be an outrageous dereliction of duty.

President Wilson's idea of freedom of the seas sets out from the notion of the sea as the common property of mankind. The logical conclusions from this very attractive theory are, however, confronted with the concrete necessities of the dominant sea Power. The system of rules sketched above curtails decidedly the offensive uses of seapower, but on the other hand it decidedly enhances England's defensive security. Under these rules England would have no occasion, so long as she maintained her preponderance over an enemy on the surface of the water, to fear either invasion, starvation, or the interruption of communication with the rest of the Empire. For the situation which would arise in the opposite contingency no system short of "absolute freedom of navigation"—to quote Mr. Wilson's phrase—would provide.

Furthermore, this system of rules would supplement the formal sanction of the league of nations with a very active interest on the part of neutrals. Like the early state, the league of nations must be prepared to assume toward disputants the alternative rôle of arbiter or referee. But in another aspect the league of nations will be, in any particular war, the neutral nations. By enlarging the rights of maritime neutrals beyond what they have been before, the above rules should have a tendency to "quicken duty with affection,"—the duty and affection being those of the league. The immense simplication, too, which these rules would effect in this field of international law furnishes yet another argument for their enforcibility.

Thus much for freedom of the seas in war; in peace it is already "absolute" in the sense that vessels in traversing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the seas are subject only to the jurisdiction of the nation whose flag they fly. But the term may be used with a more liberal connotation, as Sir Alfred Booth, Chairman of the Cunard Steamship Company has recently reminded us. "Freedom of the seas in international trade," says Sir Alfred, "in the sense of equal treatment of all flags in all ports should be a cardinal principle of the peace settlement, and freedom of the seas carries with it freedom of access to the sea. The voyage itself across the high seas is merely a link in international intercourse." President Wilson, too, has demanded that landlocked communities be given access to the sea through "the neutralization of rights of way," and it is likely that in some cases at least this suggestion will be adopted by the peace conference. An international code of port regulations is, of course, a rather different matter. But at any rate, our own merchant marine, hampered by the provisions of the La Follette-Furuseth Seamen's Act, would have much to gain and apparently little to lose by such an arrangement.

Speculation as to the future of the league of nations naturally discloses yet other phases of the question of freedom of the seas. The time may come when control of the sea and its principal arms and approaches, both natural and artificial, and even of the world's mercantile marine, may be internationalized, but that day is not yet. To cite but one instance: Great Britain can hardly be required to-day to hand over to the league of nations control over the strategic points which stake out her route to India; nor indeed is it likely that we ourselves would consent, any more than in 1900, to the internationalization of the Panama Canal. For an indefinite time, accordingly, we must expect the sea to remain under a sway that is monarchical rather than democratic; but at least the monarchy can be constitutional.

There is of course the alternative possibility which is suggested by Mr. Daniels's naval programme. But this, I imagine, was brought forward with the idea of being in fact an alternative to a more desirable arrangement. Certainly, it would be a rather ironic outcome of the efforts to establish a league of nations if the balance of power idea, expelled from the land, should re-appear on the ocean.

The German Issue in Russia

By M. ZIPPIN

ANYONE acquainted with the situation in Russia, especially in the regions which had been occupied by the Allied forces, could hardly have been surprised at the *coup d' état* of Admiral Kolchak. It was a logical outcome of a most unrealistic drama staged by hands that understood neither the true situation nor, for that matter, the public for which the play was put on. Begun as a campaign against German influence in Russia, and continued as a fight against the Bolsheviki—against the will of a majority of those who were to be saved—it could culminate only in a one-man power. Similarly, there need be no surprise at the refusal of General Semenoff to recognize the new dictator. As a matter of fact, it was he and not Kolchak who started the ball rolling, for his appearance upon the scene to "save Russia" antedates by some months the emergence of Kolchak, or even of the knowledge, on the part of the majority of those who were to be saved, that such a person as Kolchak existed. If it be true, as newspaper reports have stated, that the Allies did not favor the Omsk Government because they believed that a dictatorship was necessary, Semenoff, and not Kolchak, was logically the one to take the reins. What is more, Admiral Kolchak was at best only the agent of General Horvath's aspirations, while Semenoff had perfected himself in the art and craft of dictatorship from the start.

But how did it come about that men like Avskentieff, although a member of the right wing of the Socialist Revolutionary party, and others like Zenzenoff and Bischoffsky, should have joined with Semenoff, Kolchak, Horvath, etc.; or that such coalition should have been able to call the common people to arms against the Soviets, not enough, it is true, to make a showing on the fronts, but enough to enable the "representatives" of Russia in the Allied countries and the United States to ask for recognition and financial help? It was the words "German militarism" that did the trick. It was the insistence that the Bolsheviki were the hirelings of the Kaiser. It was the wide dissemination of the charge that Lenine and Trotzky were the agents of German Junkerism, that brought to the Kolchak standard some of the simple Russian people. It was the cry that Russia must be saved, and quickly, from the yoke of Germanism that gathered some of the Socialists around the alliance. Now, with German militarism broken, the whole issue has collapsed. German monarchism has ceased to be a menace to Russia. Another menace has sprung up, a more visible and more realistic, namely, the menace of Russian monarchism, and Social Revolutionists or Mensheviki will never fight Russian monarchism in alliance with Russian monarchists.

The self-constituted representatives of Russia who, for one reason or another, find it convenient to carry on their propaganda outside of the country rather than within it, are fond of dwelling upon the Bolshevist atrocities, knowing that this will be likely to make more effective their appeal for financial help. In Russia itself, on the other hand, they do not appear to have indulged very much in that sort of argument. I have before me a number of their reported speeches, declarations, appeals, orders, and resolutions, many of them widely published, publicly posted, and passed about among the masses; and in all of them the Bolshevik atrocities are mentioned only as a sort of secondary consideration. The great emphasis is always laid on the German enslavement of Russia, and the German part of the programme is the main and, as a rule, the sole burden of their remark. Now, with the main issue dead, with the much-heralded German enslavement plank battered, the whole platform has gone to pieces, and Avksentieff and others of the coalition have had to descend from the heights to the plain where ninety-five per cent. of the Russian people are striving to order their lives on a foundation of equality and justice; trying to find some sort of safeguard against the return of the old order—a safeguard which, rightly or wrongly, they believe they have found in their new form of democracy—the Soviets.

A few quotations taken at random are informing in this connection.

On June 20, 1918, a conference of democratic organiza-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions was held at Harbin for the purpose of discussing the "question of the moment," i. e., that of Allied intervention. A resolution was unanimously adopted, after the representatives of all the workers' organizations and some of the nationalist organizations (the Ukrainians, Letts, etc.) had demonstratively left the hall, the first part of which read as follows:

The party in power (the Bolsheviki) have heedlessly broken off our treaties with the Allies, have chosen to travel the road of a separate settlement of the war, and have destroyed our army; the result was the shameful Brest peace treaty, which is ruinous for our fatherland. Left alone to face Germany, Russia has become the prisoner of Germanic reaction. . . . The German bayonet is dictating its will to the Bolshevist authorities, who are practically the vassals of Berlin and merely profess to be independent of that power. The fundamental problem of the moment, therefore, is how to battle against the Brest peace treaty and its results; that is, how to continue the war against German imperialism. Russia can exist as an independent and free state only when she is able to free herself from German bondage, and be reunited with those integral parts of her territory that were torn away from her. All this can be attained only by repudiating the Brest treaty, by the renewal of our friendly relations with our former Allies, and by the military help which our former Allies are to give us. But the renewal of our war against Germany is conditioned upon the termination of the power of the Bolsheviki, who have lost completely their influence over the masses and are compelled to lean upon Germany, and to use in their battles against our own people the legions of German military prisoners, Magyars, and even Turks, not only in Russia but here in Siberia.

The conference just referred to was called together by some of the members of the ill-fated All-Siberian Government, which held power for a few weeks only to be absorbed by the so-called All-Russian Government, which in turn was absorbed and its members imprisoned by the dictator Kolchak. One of the leading spirits of the All-Siberian Government was N. Y. Bischoffsky, a prominent member of the Socialist Revolutionists, a member of the Petrograd Duma, of the Constituent Assembly, and of the Siberian Regional Duma. It was he who managed the conference and later directed most of the affairs of the All-Siberian Government, especially the business of bringing together the numerous locals of the Socialist Revolutionist party in Siberia. On June 30, there appeared in the Russian press of Siberia a signed statement by Bischoffsky which explicitly places the problem of freeing Russia from the bondage of Germany above every other question, and treats it, indeed, as the only question. A short quotation from this statement will suffice.

The problems of the Russian communities here in the Far East, arising from the prospect of an invasion of our territory by Allied troops, should be considered in the light of the objects for the obtaining of which we must have military help from the Allies. To my sorrow, there is no unity in our Russian society regarding this problem, as in many other problems. The census elements (the bourgeois class), if one were to judge from the speeches delivered at their conference on June 18, and from the resolution adopted by that conference, are under the impression that the first and cardinal purpose of Allied intervention is the reëstablishment of order, while the renewal of our war with Germany and the reëstablishment of our front is secondary. For them the main work of the Allied troops should consist in exterminating the Bolsheviki, and the more extreme representatives of these elements, and those who are frank, would openly include in the fight for extermination all the "left" Socialists—in fact, all the Socialists. As to the rehabilitation of the front, this is only a secondary matter with them, and may or may not follow after the main purpose is accomplished.

On the other hand, the democracy that acquiesces in and even regards as imperative the military help of the Allies judges the problems of the Allied troops on our territory altogether differently. The majority of our democracy, while acknowledging the necessity of this help, declares emphatically that it is needed by us not for "home consumption," but only and explicitly for a renewed war on Germanism, for the rehabilitation of our fighting power, and for the establishment of our fighting front. That is why our democracy makes it the foremost condition that the Allies are not to interfere in our internal affairs. To the extent that the Bolsheviki are helped by armed and organized bands of German war prisoners, our fight against the Bolsheviki is at one with that of the Allies; in other respects the Bolshevik problem is strictly an internal affair of our own, and we can take care of it very well ourselves without any outside help.

It should be noted that Mr. Bischoffsky speaks here for only a part, a very small minority in fact, of the Socialist Revolutionist party, since that party could not, under the circumstances, hold any convention or referendum that, under the rules of the party, would be binding upon the members. A handful of the members only held a secret conference in Siberia and decided to invite Allied intervention, and even so by no means unanimously, on the conditions stated by Mr. Bischoffsky.

The Socialist Democrat Mensheviki are even more vigorously opposed to the Bolsheviki than are the Socialist Revolutionists. Nevertheless, this party has never declared itself officially in favor of Allied intervention in Russia; on the contrary, the majority of the party has strongly opposed such intervention at all times and has gone on record against any active conflict with the Bolsheviki, even without any outside help.

The story of the struggle against the Bolsheviki in Russia on the part of the other Socialist parties, particularly the party of the Socialist Revolutionists, is almost as stirring as that of the Bolshevist upheaval itself. How the Socialists of the Right could not oppose, openly and actively, those who, after all, were truly the representatives of the masses; how they stooped to a coalition with men of the Semenoff-Kolchak type, at the same time trying their best to preserve their Socialist character; and how they are still endeavoring to win back the masses that are lost to them, is a dramatic chapter of recent Russian history which still remains to be written.

The world may think that the differences between the Tchernoffs and Martoffs on one hand and the Lenines and Kameneffs on the other are so great that there can never be any understanding between them, whereas, in fact, they practically speak the same language, preach the same doctrines, and defend the same cause. The difference is that the Tchernoffs and Martoffs have not as yet disengaged themselves as completely from the accepted doctrinal programmes as have Lenine and his followers. A further cause of factional quarreling is the jealousy which defeated leaders like Tchernoff cherish of the victorious ones. No considerable number of followers, however, can ever be won on theoretical issues alone, and, aside from the German question, differences between Lenine and his defeated opponents to-day are mainly theoretical. The only positive living issue of the Socialist opponents of the Bolsheviki, namely, the German enslavement of Russia, has found its settlement, and one may look with hope to the not distant time when all the Socialist groups will unite in the effort to build up a truly democratic Russia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Race and Religion in Northern Bohemia

By EDWARD T. HEYN

THE conflict between the Czecho-Slovaks and the German-speaking element of Bohemia presents a difficult problem for the future to solve. As though to rebuke the aspirations of the German element in northern Bohemia, as evidenced by their recent establishment of an independent republic with Reichenberg as its capital, the Czechs have lately occupied such German-speaking towns as Tetschen-Bodenbach, Carlsbad, and Aussig, and have raised their flag over the occupied communities.

German is the language of northern Bohemia, and of practically the whole of the former American Consular district of Reichenberg, extending from the Saxon border to Tetschen-Bodenbach on the south. Such cities as Reichenberg, Gablonz, Trautenau, Friedland, Haida, Steinschoenau, Maffersdorf, Deutsch-Gabel, Joachimsthal, Braunau, Zwickau, Warnsdorf, and many others familiar to American manufacturers and importers, are inhabited chiefly by German-speaking Bohemians. Czech was spoken in Jitschin, Jungbunzlau, Koeniggreaetz, Muenchengreatz, Turnau, and Neustadt. To the west of Bohemia, in such well-known cities as Carlsbad, Marienbad, Franzensbad, Teplitz, Eger, and Aussig, on the other hand, the language of the inhabitants is predominantly German.

Reichenberg, the new capital of the potential German state of Bohemia, was before the war an important centre of the Austrian textile and glass industry. Ten years ago it was an ultra-German town, its inhabitants differing but little from their near Saxon neighbors. This was not surprising, as many of the people of northern Bohemia are of German origin, their ancestors having come originally from Saxony and Bavaria. At public meetings held in Reichenberg the Austrian national hymn was usually received with little enthusiasm in marked contrast to the spirit exhibited when the *Wacht am Rhein* was played. One of the principal public squares of the city bears the name of "Bismarck Platz," and the inhabitants appear to have forgotten that the German Chancellor in 1866, during the Austro-Prussian war, invaded the place at the head of the German troops.

Moreover, the inhabitants of northern Bohemia have all along disliked the term "Bohemian," for by that name they designated the Czechs. The people call themselves "Deutsche" or "Deutsch-Boehmen." The excellent schools in northern Bohemia were conducted largely on German pedagogical lines, and German was the language not only of officials, business men, churches, and theatres, but of society in general. The Czech population in Reichenberg, however, increased steadily while the German population has declined. The number of Czech workmen employed in the manufacturing establishments of the city and its neighborhood has grown larger year by year. Manufacturers admitted that the Czech workmen were industrious and reliable, but also that they were less independent and worked for lower wages than the German workmen. Czech societies, especially the well-known gymnastic "Sokols," were to be found in Reichenberg, and two years before the war two Czech banks were established in that city.

The foreign observer who lived in Bohemia before the war could hardly fail to note the growth of bitterness and strained relations between the two nationalities. So marked, indeed, became the differences and internecine strife that the Imperial Austrian Government was forced to dissolve the Bohemian Diet and assume control of Bohemian state affairs. As a result of a failure of legislative appropriations, the state treasury was empty, public works could not be carried on, and officials and teachers went unpaid. This condition of affairs continued until 1912, when a truce was patched up between the warring nationalities, but the struggle was renewed in 1913, and has continued to the present time.

What are the real causes of these differences? The German element in Bohemia, fully cognizant of the growing power of the Czechs, clearly realized many years ago the necessity of doing something to conserve its language and political rights. The Germans maintained that, economically considered, they were the richest and most powerful element in the whole Austrian Empire, but that the taxes which they paid, amounting to over a million dollars annually, were spent in aiding Czech schools and other institutions. They charged, for example, that while such important industrial centres as Reichenberg and Gablonz furnished over 50 per cent. of the increment taxes of Bohemia and 16 per cent. of those of the Empire, Czech cities such as Prague, Pilsen, and Budweis were paying much less.

German Bohemia accordingly demanded that an independent province of its own be established within the Empire, entirely separate from Prague, with its own Stadthalter or President, its own officials, courts, schools, universities, and mining academies, and separate state commissions for taxation, agriculture, and other departments. In short, they asked for complete autonomy. They were especially emphatic in insisting that, in order to settle the vexed language question, appropriations for school purposes should be spent in maintaining only the schools of each respective nationality. They also insisted that the German university at Prague, the German teachers' seminary, and the German section of the modern gallery in the Bohemian capital, should be transferred to northern Bohemia. Finally, it was urged that two new Catholic dioceses should be established, in addition to the bishopric of Leitmeritz already existing, and that additional superintendents should be also appointed to conserve the religious interests of the Protestant population of German Bohemia. Needless to say, the Czechs bitterly opposed this far-reaching German-Bohemian plan of home-rule as likely to split the state. Yet by a strange irony of fate, due to the world war and especially to the establishment of the Czecho-Slovak Republic and the Independent German Bohemian Government in Reichenberg, this plan has become a reality.

On one question, however, the liberal elements at least of German Bohemia were in accord with the Young Czechs, and that was regarding the necessity of curbing the power of the feudal aristocracy. In its declaration of independence made in Philadelphia, the Czecho-Slovak Council announced that the large feudal estates in Bohemia should be divided and redeemed for home colonization, and that patents of nobility should be abolished. The German element years ago charged that, of the 944 square miles of Bohemian territory, more than 100 square miles were in the hands of 57

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noble families. The German Bohemians urged that the exclusive privileges of the feudal nobility, many of whom were closely allied with the Old Czechs, and of the Clergy, in the Landesausschuss and the Diet, ought to be reduced, and that the German element should be accorded the same representation in these bodies as was accorded to the Czechs.

At the conference of the Democratic Mid-European Union held at Philadelphia in October, 1918, Professor Thomas G. Masaryk is reported to have said:

> We all agree that the minorities must be protected, and this question involves another, viz., how far the union can bring about a closer union of the nations. The economic basis of such a union would prepare for a closer relationship in the federated state. The educational system must be such that it will promote close friendship; in a word, the league of nations as contemplated by President Wilson.

In an article in the *Nation* of October 5, Professor Masaryk again declared that the rights of the minority will be safe-guarded, even those of the German minorities, but he is also emphatic in stating that the German minorities will not be joined to Germany. A recent press dispatch states that the Czech newspaper *Narodny Listy*, published at Prague, had declared that German Bohemia will not be permitted to unite with Germany. The *Vecer*, another Czech journal, goes so far as to demand the inclusion in the Czech state of lower Austria, including Vienna, and adds that the Czechs in lower Austria must not be isolated, and that most of the inhabitants of Vienna or their parents came from Bohemia and Moravia. The *Vecer* also asks for the inclusion of Prussian Silesia in the Czech state.

The action of the German Bohemians in establishing a Government of their own at Reichenberg, however, seems to indicate some doubt as to whether northern Bohemia may not join the new Germany. As a matter of fact, the future status of the German element in the former Austro-Hungarian Empire will depend entirely upon the treatment accorded it by the new Czecho-Slovak Republic. Will the German minority in Bohemia, for example, be allowed in the future to speak its own language? The Prussian Government for decades was guilty of injustice in attempting to force the German language upon its unwilling Polish subjects. Will the Czecho-Slovak nation do the same with the German minorities within its borders? Professor Masaryk has stated that the Czechs "will never accept the ideals of Prussia and of Germany which would enslave the world with military drill and Machiavellian misuse." Again it may be asked, will the Czechs, by according Prussian treatment to the German Bohemians, force them into the arms of this same Germany?

The economic future of the new Bohemia, which before the war was the most prosperous part of the Austrian Empire, and which includes most of the manufacturing establishments, the coal and iron mines, and the famous springs known all over the world, will depend largely upon the settlement of the differences between the Czech and the German elements. In his interesting book entitled "Nationality and the War," published in 1915, the British author Arnold Toynbee says: "No settlement is worth considering that does not satisfy the Czech aspirations, but their claims are likely to be exaggerated." Mr. Toynbee also calls attention to the fact that on the border of Bohemia are districts which are solidly German, and that German-speaking elements are to be found in most of the towns, especially in Moravia; and he adds the significant statement that while the old political system decreed that the Czechs should become a nation, on the economic side it has brigaded them inexorably with the German group. The economic future of the new Bohemia will also depend much upon whether the River Elbe, which runs through Bohemia and reaches the sea at Hamburg, is to be accessible to the whole country from its source to its mouth. In any case, the future economic prosperity of the new Czech nation will be greatly lessened if northern Bohemia remains an independent state, or on the other hand, decides to become a part of the new Germany.

The far-reaching economic possibilities of northern Bohemia are indicated by the fact that until the United States broke off relations with Austria-Hungary, the American Government maintained a consulate at Reichenberg. This consulate was located in one of the most thickly populated regions of Europe, and in a district where there were probably more industrial establishments than in any other region of equal size in the world. At Reichenberg and in its vicinity were important textile factories, producing fabrics and velveteens of fine quality; at Trautenau, on the German border, linens were manufactured; at Gablonz, a half hour's ride by railway from Reichenberg, was the seat of the famous glass button and artificial jewelry industry; Haida and Neuvelt produced fine glassware and china; on the Saxon border artificial flowers and sparteries were manufactured; at Tetschen, on the Elbe, was to be found the largest button-factory in Europe; and at Maffersdorf, near Reichenberg, was one of the most extensive carpet plants in Europe. Fully to appreciate the industrial importance of northern Bohemia, one needs only to turn to the reports made before the war by the American consuls in Reichenberg and Carlsbad. The combined export figures of the Reichenberg and Carlsbad consulates for 1913 and 1914, exceeding those of the Prague consulate, have an important bearing upon the question whether the new Czecho-Slovak Republic can get on without the German element in northern Bohemia.

It is fortunate that the leaders of the Czecho-Slovak Republic have come out flatly in favor of the complete separation of state and church. Professor Masaryk, in the article in the *Nation* already referred to, admirably characterized the former Austro-Hungarian Empire as a "theocratic monarchy," and spoke of the Hapsburgs as having degraded the Catholic Church within its borders to the level of "an inexpensive spiritual police." He adds that the Catholic people and parties of Bohemia are opposed to Austria. While this latter statement is true of the Czechs and of many German Bohemians, it is not so certain that all Bohemian Catholics will be enthusiastic over the announced separation of church and state. It must be remembered that the largest percentage of the people of Bohemia are adherents of the Roman Catholic Church, only a comparatively small number being Protestants or Jews. The separation of church and state is, however, of vital importance, if real democracy is to be brought about in the former Austria-Hungary and it will be interesting to see how such separation will work in Bohemia. How far-reaching the step will be can be seen, for example, from the fact that the Masonic order was unable to meet at Reichenberg before the war, and had to go to Goerlitz, close to the Bohemian border, to conduct its sessions.

Whatever the policy of the Czecho-Slovak Republic may be, I am frankly sceptical of its ability to establish a close national sympathy between the Germans and the Czechs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The existing antagonism has been correctly pointed out by President Wilson in his early book, "The State," when he says: "Pride of race and the memories of a notable and distinguished history will always keep the Czechs at odds with the Germans within their gates." It remains to be seen whether the rulers of the Czecho-Slovak state will be be able to change a condition which Mr. Wilson regarded as ineradicable.

Correspondence

The Issues in the Baltic States

Stockholm, December 17

COPENHAGEN has recently been the scene of an inter-Scandinavian conference held as a successor to the meetings of sovereigns and ministers inaugurated four years ago by King Gustav of Sweden. The modest aim of the meeting of 1914 was to regulate "economic questions arising out of the war"; to-day the scope is more ambitious, for the recent Copenhagen Conference resulted in a purely Scandinavian scheme for the league of nations and a pan-Scandinavian programme for limitation of armaments. But diplomacy in the northern European states is as secret as elsewhere, and no other transactions of the conference have been revealed.

It was relatively easy to frame a pan-Scandinavian international policy, though Scandinavian coöperation in modern times has never extended to seriously contentious questions. War has made coöperation even more difficult, for the problem is no longer Scandinavian but Baltic. Norway, therefore, is almost outside the present group, which lacks racial and cultural solidarity, as only two out of a possible five or even six Baltic countries are Scandinavian. The states that will demand recognition in Baltic affairs are Finland, those precarious state-entities the Esthonian and Lettish republics, and perhaps a future Courland. The ties that bind them are a common Lutheranism, a like passion for independence, and a repugnance to any great Baltic Power, either Germany or Russia. Though these two countries are now prostrate, the recuperative powers of Germany are formidable and Russia's aggressive propaganda is unabated.

In Sweden, Denmark, and Finland the conservative parties display much of the vigorous and not over-scrupulous nationalism that marks the typical Great Power. They stand resolutely for armaments; for what was formerly called in Europe a "spirited foreign policy"; and for the attainment of "national aims." Domestic politics are dominated by the conflict between these nationalists and the more internationally minded Liberals, Radicals, and Socialists. In Sweden the contrast is more marked than elsewhere, for Sweden cherishes the memory of the "Great Power Age," the adventurous and profitable *Storhetslid* of Gustav Adolf, of Oxenstierna, and of Charles XII, whose bicentenary has just been celebrated with pious pride. The tradition of diplomacy in the grand style still lingers in the dingy little Foreign Office on *Gustav Adolf's Torg*. These opposing forces, also, marked Scandinavia's attitude towards the war. The Conservatives under M. Hammarskjœld, incited by Sven Hedin and by Professor Kjellen and Professor Steffen, stood for Germany because for years they had been opposing Russia. The Liberals and Socialists, on the contrary, had for years ridiculed the "Russian Peril" and so automatically became pro-Ally. This attitude still persists. The Conservatives aim to acquire the Aland Islands and to crush Russia—which they call suppressing Bolshevism. The Liberals and moderate Socialists (Branting's majority) are against such adventures; and the Left Socialists, who are akin to the Bolsheviki, are also avowed "defence-Nihilists." "Defence-Nihilism" is a term coined before the war to fit persons opposed to armaments of every kind.

In Denmark conditions are the same. The Left Socialists recently rioted for immediate universal disarmament. The Radicals are Socialists who support M. Zahle's Cabinet* are also against armaments, but are more patient. The Conservatives with the Moderate Left party, which is led by ex-Prime Minister Christensen, think that disarmament would be premature. So far the anti-armament parties have won. The Zahle Cabinet has created a commission to proclaim the abolition of compulsory service, and the demolition of Copenhagen's defences. Before the war Denmark had no fear of Russia, but great fear of Germany. Therefore German and not Russian aggression stimulated the demands of the Conservatives for armaments and a spirited foreign policy.

The story is the same in Finland. The Murman adventure was largely inspired by the Conservative Old-Finns, who demanded "unredeemed Karelia," and who to-day talk of union with "Finnish Ingermannland" and Esthonia, while the more liberal Young-Finns are much more reserved. The new states that have risen on the ruins of Russia's Baltic provinces have not yet clarified their policies. In Sweden, Denmark, and Finland the advocates of a spirited foreign policy are not now in power. In Copenhagen M. Zahle has strengthened his position by conceding the Socialist demand for the abolition of armaments. In Stockholm Professor Eden, a pacifist Liberal, has gained prestige by forcing the Conservatives to yield on the Upper Chamber question. Finland's new Premier, Professor Ingmann, though of the Old-Finn party, has cut loose from the Karelian adventure. All three Governments are faced by opposition, but they are in a cautious mood at present and seem disposed to take what the Peace Conference may grant.

Bolshevism is the first problem which the Conservatives wish to solve without the interference of any Great Power. For the Bolsheviki have the zeal and indifference to consequences of religious propagandists, backed by means and arms. The Bolshevist agitator Neumann, lately expelled from Copenhagen, proclaimed that the Soviets must be at war with the world because "Bolshevism is like Islam; it makes peace only with those it has converted." The Swedes are in a panic over Bolshevism; their newspapers declare that *Socialismus asiaticus* is merely a new form of the old Russian curse that has always terrified Sweden. Red-flagged Bolshevist ships hold up ships in the Gulf of Finland to force them to adhere to the Bolshevik cause. Sweden has this week broken off its present *de facto* relations with the unrecognized Soviet Government and has ordered its envoy to leave.

The most insistent demand of the Baltic Conservatives for extreme action against Bolshevism comes from Finland, which has been fiercely anti-Bolshevik since the Red and White civil war of a year ago. Finland's Russian frontier is air-tight; no Bolshevik sets foot across it, but nearly every week there are frontier clashes. Since Finland has 100,000 men under arms the temptation to act may be too strong for even the peaceful M. Ingmann. By crushing Bolshevism Finland might annex Ingermannland, which is largely Finnish in population, and might even enter Petrograd. Even the Esthonians, in fear of the Bolsheviks, are fleeing from Resal to Helsingfors with the inevitable result that the question is discussed in Helsingfors: "Why should we not rescue our Esthonian kinsmen and unite the Finnish race?"

The other question pressing for settlement concerns the Aland Islands. The situation is simple but the solution obscure. Sweden fears that the islands will fall into the hands of a Great Power and that the Russian threat to Stockholm will be repeated. Before 1809, when by the Peace of Fredrikshamn Aland and Finland were ceded to Russia, the islands were considered as part, not of Finland, but of Sweden. Sweden claims, therefore, that, once broken loose from Russia, they should return to Sweden. The Alanders unanimously declare for Sweden, but they are opposed by their own kinsmen, the 400,000 Swedes on the Finnish mainland, whose culture and language are threatened by the Fennoman majority. Aland is the present obstacle to coöperation among the Baltic States.

R. L.

*NOTE: The Zahle Cabinet fell on March 1.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

A Sixteenth-Century League of Nations*

THE constitution of a sixteenth-century league of nations designed to secure lasting peace between the Christian nations of Europe offers an interesting parallel with the provisions of the league now in process of formation. Taking advantage of the conclusion of hostilities between France and Great Britain and the appeal of Pope Leo X for peace between the nations of Europe in order more successfully to combat the danger of Turkish invasion, Thomas Wolsey, advisor to Henry VIII of England, secured the ratification of new treaties recognizing the principle of universal peace. On October 2, 1518, the treaty was ratified in St. Paul's Cathedral by Henry VIII and the French plenipotentiaries, and on December 2 in Paris by Francis I. Quite reluctantly Charles of Spain signed the agreement on January 14, 1519; and Leo X, though "deeply mortified that the office of mediator and peace maker had thus passed from the Holy See to the Chancellor of England," was also compelled to join in the compact of universal peace. The league lasted only one year.

The preamble declares that the Pope, the Emperor Elect, the King of France, the King of Spain, and the King of England had concluded a holy league to combat the "tyrant of the Turk"; and that the immediate consequence of this league must be a general peace of Christendom. Accordingly, the "contracting parties, their heirs and successors, subjects and dominions, proclaimed peace and good will" henceforth to be observed between the members of the league. Then followed the main articles embodying the principles and organization of the new alliance and the obligations of the members and the principal contracting parties.

Article 2. As far as the defence of the Christian Church and the Pope, or of the states and possessions of any one of the contracting princes is concerned, all the members of the league are to be "friends of the friends and foes of the foes" of any one of them.

If any one of the contracting parties or of those who are included in this treaty attacks, invades, or does any other injury to the states, dominions, towns, castles, etc., of any other member of this league, or any prince who is included in this treaty, the injured party is at liberty to require by letters patent the aid of all the other contracting parties. Those who are thus requested are bound, together with the injured party, to send letters and ambassadors to the aggressor or aggressors, asking him or them to desist from further hostilities, and to make full reparation.

If the aggressor or aggressors continues or continue his or their hostilities in spite of this exhortation to maintain peace, or if he or they refuses or refuse to make full reparation, all the other confederates are bound to declare war with the aggressor or aggressors within one month after being summoned to do so. Within two months after the declaration of war, they are to begin actual hostilities by attacking or invading the dominions of the aggressor or aggressors with an army strong enough to conquer the enemy. Every one of the contracting parties is bound to pay his own expenses.

Article 3. If the aggressor, whether he be one of the principal contracting parties or only included in this treaty, possesses dominions, towns, or ports near the French, Spanish, English, or German seas, the Kings, of France, of Spain, and of England are bound to make war upon him, not only by land but also by sea. The fleets are to be so numerous and so well provided with men, guns, and all other engines of war, as to be sufficiently strong to attack and conquer the fleets or armies of the enemy. The fleets must, within one month after the declaration or commencement of war, be at sea, each party paying its own expenses. All the ships are to sail at once to the seas which are nearest the states and possessions of the enemy, and to remain there, cruising and doing as much harm to the enemy, his friends, and abettors, as they can. As often as it may be necessary to resist the enemy with united forces, the different fleets of the contracting parties are to assemble in one place, and to act in common. None of the contracting parties is at liberty to recall his fleet, or to diminish the number of his vessels and armed men, without the consent of all the other contracting parties. Should any of these fleets be reduced to smaller proportions in a battle, or by shipwreck, or by any other reason, the prince or princes to whom it belongs is or are bound, within one month, to raise the number of ships and armed men to their former proportions.

Article 4. The stipulations of the preceding article do not refer to an attack or rebellion of the subjects of any of the contracting parties against their Government, except in case they have been instigated, assisted, or favored in their undertaking by one of the other contracting parties, in which case all the other contracting parties are bound to make war, not only upon the rebellious subjects, but also upon those who favor or abet them.

Article 5. If any one of the contracting parties, or of the confederates who will hereafter become members of this league, intend to attack the enemies of the league, and wish for that purpose to march their troops through the states, territories, cities, seaports, etc., of one of the other contracting parties, or their confederates, the party requested to permit the passage of the troops of a confederate through his states is bound not only to raise no difficulties, but even to assist them, and to provide them with provisions, vehicles, etc., the prince who makes the request paying the expenses. . . .

Article 8. The contracting parties bind themselves not to undertake anything in their towns, seaports, etc., that could be prejudicial to any one of the other contracting parties or their subjects; or to permit others to undertake or attempt anything of that kind. . . .

Article 11. This treaty is to be communicated to the Pope, who is at liberty, within four months, to enter into it as one of the principal contracting parties, confirming it by a Bull, and naming his confederates.

If any one of the other principal contracting princes should not already have sent sufficient power to England to conclude this treaty, he is to send such power to ratify the treaty, and to swear to it within four months. If he permits that time to elapse without having fulfilled these formalities, and afterwards asks the King of France and the King of England to admit him as principal party into this confederacy, he is not to be considered as one of the principal contracting parties, but only included in this treaty, although he has in the preamble of it been mentioned as one of the principal contracting parties.

Article 12. All former treaties remain in full force, except in so far as they are in contradition to this treaty.

Article 13. All Christian princes are at liberty to declare, within the space of eight months, their intention to become members of this league, in which case the principal contracting parties are bound to accept them and to defend them, at the expense, however, of the party asking to be assisted.

Article 14. The Kings of France and of England, who are the originators of this league, bind themselves towards one another that, if either of them be invaded or attacked by any prince or Power, the other will lead in person the army which is to assist the attacked prince. Even if none of the other Christian princes should become members of this league, it is to remain in full force in so far as France and England are concerned.

*NOTE: For the text of the agreement and the facts concerning it, the *Nation* is indebted to Professor R. C. McGrane, of the University of Cincinnati.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Education in Prussia

THE programme of educational reform in the Prussian schools, issued soon after the revolution by Adolph Hoffman, the Prussian Minister of Education, and his assistant, Dr. Gustav Wyneke, has been received, according to the *Berner Tagwacht,* with general satisfaction. The only question arousing controversy is that involving the effect upon education of the separation of church and state. Later announcements by the Ministry of Education have modified the provisions of the decree to the extent of allowing time for religious instruction, and permitting teachers or members of the local clergy to give such instruction. The following text of the decree is taken from the *Berner Tagwacht.*

A. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The separation of church and state has been settled in principle, a memorandum has been worked out, a commission is being organized. 2. Religion has ceased to be an examination subject, and the introduction of nonsectarian moral teaching is being arranged. 3. Supervision of schools by the local clergy and participation of the clergy in the district inspections are abolished. All positions of district inspector are to be in the official class. 4. Mixed education of boys and girls has already been introduced in some schools. 5. Teachers and scholars receive powers of self-government. 6. All chauvinism is banished from the instruction, and especially from the instruction of history. 7. Prussia will propose the assembly of a school conference for the whole Empire. 8. Uniformity of the course of instruction in all schools is secured, and the abolition of class schools will be begun immediately. 9. The office of rector will be deprived of its autocratic character and established upon a collegiate basis. 10. The school authorities are instructed to promote among teachers' unions and at official conferences discussions of educational and cultural matters in the spirit of the new age. 11. The Ministry of Education will include as representatives of the Socialist party two Ministers, one Under-Secretary, one principal adviser, and two assistant advisers. 12. Connection will be established with champions of the new order throughout the whole country. A list will be made of suitable candidates for renewing the corps of officials and teachers. 13. The final examinations in the secondary schools will be changed, and the number of examinations will be reduced. 14. The Prussian Ministry of Education claims a share of the confiscated Royal castles for the purposes of national education, as training schools, boarding schools, model seminaries, museums, and national high schools. 15. Physical culture has been deprived of its military character.

B. TEACHERS

16. No teacher may in future be compelled to give religious education. 17. It has been proposed to the Ministry of War that all teachers shall be released immediately from their military obligations. 18. Work for those who want work! Immediate provision of employment for teachers who return from the field, by reducing the size of classes, filling all vacant posts, and the establishment of special courses for upper-class men who were in the war. 19. Amnesty will be applied in the discretion of the Ministry of Justice to all teachers who have received disciplinary punishment. 20. Teachers who have been punished for their political or religious convictions are to be reinstated. 21. The teachers will have representatives in the Government and in the school administration. The Socialist teacher Menzel has been appointed principal adviser in the Ministry of Education. 22. Tried teachers will be appointed to district inspectorships of schools without special examination.

C. UNIVERSITIES

23. Prominent representatives of scientific Socialism and of other tendencies which have hitherto been systematically excluded are to be appointed to university chairs. 24. A system of national high schools is to be built up on broad lines, and to be placed in organic connection with existing schools and high schools. 25. The reorganization of the technical high schools will be effected in close connection with the universities. 26. The social, legal, and financial position of the assistant teachers in universities (Privatdozenten) is to be raised. 27. Freedom of doctrine in the universities is to be rid of its last fetters. 28. Professorships and research institutes for sociology will be established.

D. GENERAL CULTURE

29. The theatres will be put under the Ministry of Education. The censorship of the theatre has been abolished. 30. Opportunity for work, and relief where necessary, will be given to unemployed artists and writers on their return from the field. 31. Changes in the manner of exhibition will be made in consultation with groups representing each art. 32. The Royal theatres will become national theatres, and the Court orchestras will become national orchestras.

A Spartacan Manifesto

THE manifesto of the Spartacus group in Germany to the working class of the world issued in the early days of the revolution was published in Switzerland and later in the *Populaire* (Paris) of January 11 from which the following is taken. According to an article in the *Populaire* of January 10, printed in the last issue of the International Relations Section, the manifesto was previously suppressed by the French censor. Of the four signers of the manifesto two, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, have been murdered, and Franz Mehring has died.

TO THE MEN AND WOMEN WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES:

COMRADES: The Revolution has reached Germany. The soldier masses who for four years were driven to the shambles by the profiteering capitalists, the working-class masses who during the same four years were deceived, oppressed, starved, have risen in revolt. Prussian militarism, that terrible instrument of oppression, that scourge of humanity, has been overthrown. Its most prominent representatives, and consequently those *par excellence* responsible for this war, the Emperor and the Crown Prince, have fled. Soldiers' and workmen's councils are being formed everywhere.

Proletarians of all countries, we do not say that in Germany all power is actually in the hands of the working people, or that complete victory for the proletarian revolution has been obtained. Those Socialists who in August, 1914, abandoned our most sacred principle, and who during four years have betrayed the German working class and the Internationale at the same time, are still a part of the Government. But the real German working class speaks to you now, fellow proletarians. We believe we have the right to speak to you in the name of the real working class of Germany. In order to live up to our international duties we have been compelled from the first days of this war to combat with all our power this criminal Government and scourge it as the party actually guilty of precipitating the war.

At last we are justified before history, before the Internationale, and before the German proletariat. The masses enthusiastically admit that we are right, and larger and larger fractions recognize that the time has come for an accounting with the dominant capitalist class. But the German proletariat cannot alone complete this great work; it cannot wage the struggle and win the victory without appealing to the solidarity of the working class of the entire world.

Comrades of the belligerent countries, we know your situation. We know full well that your Governments, now that they have won the victory, will undertake by the outward splendor and glory of that victory to dazzle and blind at birth the popular movements of the people toward liberty. We know that they will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make use of the victory to make the people forget the causes and objects of this wholesale murder.

But we also know another thing, and that is that the working classes of your countries have suffered terribly in flesh and blood; they are tired of this horrible carnage; they are now returning to their homes where they will find nothing but misery and poverty, while fortunes reaching hundreds of millions have accumulated in the hands of the capitalists. These workers understand now that the war was carried on by their Governments, as well as by our Government, in the interest of the money lords. And they will recognize, moreover, that their Governments in speaking of the "rights of civilization," of the "defense of small nations," speak, as our Government spoke, in the interest of capitalist profits. The working classes of your countries understand that the "peace of justice" and of the "society of nations" leads to the same despicable and cowardly rapacity as did the peace of Brest-Litovsk. Here as there the same immodest greed, the same desire to oppress, the same determination to exploit to the utmost limit through the preponderant power of military strength.

Imperialism in every country does not know conciliation. It knows but one right, the right of capitalist profits. It speaks but one language, that of the sword. It uses but one method, violence. And when imperialists now talk of the "society of peoples," of "disarmament," of the "rights of small nations," of "self-determination of peoples," they utter nothing but the habitual and lying phrases of the dominant class, designed to lull to sleep the vigilance of the proletariat.

Workers of every country! This war should be the last war. We owe it to the 12,000,000 murdered victims, to our children, to humanity.

By this infamous murder of the peoples Europe is ruined. Twelve million dead bodies fill the horrible graves dug by imperialist crime. The flower of youth and the best manhood of the peoples have been mowed down. Productive forces without measure have been destroyed. Humanity has shed nearly all its blood through this slaughter without parallel in the history of the world. Conquerors as well as conquered stand on the brink of the precipice. The direst poverty and the stoppage of the mechanism of production are imminent, and epidemics and degeneration menace humanity.

The responsible criminals for this horrible anarchy and this unchained chaos are the dominant classes, and they are unable to rise above the work they have wrought. The brute of capitalism precipitated the hell of the world war. And now it can neither avert disorder nor establish genuine order nor assure to tortured humanity bread and work, peace and civilization, justice and liberty.

The peace and justice that the ruling classes are preparing are nothing but a new régime of brute violence, out of which the hydra of oppression, hatred, and new and bloody wars raise their thousand heads.

Socialism alone is capable of consummating the great work of a durable peace. Alone it can cure the thousand wounds of humanity and transform into flourishing gardens the fields of Europe trampled under foot by the horsemen of the apocalypse. Alone out of the general destruction it can multiply ten-fold the productive forces. It will awaken all the physical and moral forces of humanity, substituting for hatred and discord fraternal solidarity and concord and respect for all human beings.

If the representatives of the working people of every country clasp hands with us under the banner of Socialism to conclude peace, peace will be concluded within a few hours. Then there will be no disputes over the left bank of the Rhine, nor over Mesopotamia, nor over Egypt and the colonies. There will be but one people: the working class of every race and every language. There will be but one justice: the equality of all men. There will be but one aim: prosperity and progress for every one.

Humanity is faced with the following alternative: dissolution and disappearance in capitalist anarchy or rebirth by the social revolution. The hour for decision has struck. If you believe in Socialism, it is time to demonstrate it by action. If you are a Socialist, you must act now.

Workers of all countries! If we summon you now to make common cause with us, it is not in the interests of the German capitalists, who, under the banner of the "German nation," are trying to escape the consequences of their own crime. No! We summon you to make common cause with us in your own interest. Face the facts. Your victorious capitalists are ready to repress in a bloody manner the revolution in Germany because they fear it will reach them. You, yourselves, are not enjoying greater liberty because of the "victory." The "victory" has reinforced your slavery. If your ruling classes succeed in strangling the proletarian revolution in Germany and in Russia, then they will turn upon you with redoubled fury. Your capitalists hope that victory over us and revolutionary Russia will give them the power to scourge you and build upon the tomb of Socialism a thousand-year empire of exploitation.

That is why we cry aloud: Arise and face the struggle! Arise and act! The time for empty demonstrations, platonic resolutions, and sounding words has passed. The hour for action has struck for the Internationale. We pledge ourselves to name everywhere soldiers' and workmen's councils who will take over the political power and working together will establish peace.

Neither Lloyd George nor Poincaré, neither Sonnino nor Wilson, neither Erzberger nor Scheidemann should conclude peace. It is under the floating banner of the worldwide Socialist revolution that peace should be made.

Workers of all countries! We summon you to accomplish the task of socialist liberation, to restore a human form to violated humanity, and to give a living meaning to the phrase with which we formerly greeted each other and with which we bade each other goodbye:

"The Internationale will be mankind!" ("L'Internationale sera le genre humain!")

CLARA ZETKIN
ROSA LUXEMBURG
KARL LIEBKNECHT
FRANZ MEHRING

The Appeal of the Independent Socialists

THE Independent Socialists of Germany, who secured twenty-four seats in the National Assembly at Weimar, issued, prior to the elections, a manifesto addressed to "the party—men and women citizens." The following text of the manifesto is taken from the *Humanite* (Paris) of January 20.

The National Assembly has been called for the 16th of February subject to the approval of the General Congress on December 16 of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers.

The final authority has thus been placed in the hands of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers; it was after the intervention of our comrades of the Council of the People's Commissioners that this decision was reached. However, to-day, we are going to decide our attitude as a political party just as if the date of the election was certain. The Independent Party enters the electoral battle boldly. It has kept the red flag without stain. At a time when all the other parties capitulated to imperialism, at a time when they became the shameful accessories to the greatest crime in history, when they bowed before the unchained demons of nationalism and the greed for spoils, it remained steadfastly faithful to the principles of socialism and the solidarity of nations. When the policy of the old Social-Democratic Party deviated more and more from those obligations whose fulfillment was demanded imperatively by the needs of the proletariat, when, by means of violence and trickery, Socialist action was made impossible for us, we left the old party for whose greatness we had worked unceasingly. We placed socialism, the cause of the German proletariat, and of the international proletariat above

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the party. Since then we have carried on a struggle, laborious, systematic, and fearless, in order that the strength of the German proletariat should not be used to prolong a disastrous war. We have done everything in order that the working class might come to be, instead of the tool of war, the bringer of peace.

Our action has met with success. The struggle against the war was also work in the cause of the revolution.

Opposed by all parties, commencing with the Socialists of the Right, the Independent Social-Democratic Party was the bearer of the revolutionary idea, realized later by the bold action of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers.

The 9th of November consecrated our work. Germany is a Socialist republic. Our present concern is to make it permanent. It is to this achievement that our efforts must be directed. The powers of the era that is past have not yet been wholly destroyed. The counter revolution lifts its head and attempts to take its first step. It is against this that we must contend with all our power. We must do away with the supporters of the régime that has been abolished, and take all possible measures for assuring the results of the revolution and carrying them on to the establishment of the Socialist state.

In remaining steadfastly faithful to our Socialist principles, the truth of which has already been confirmed by the course of historical development, we demand a complete transformation of society. We demand that socialism be put into practice at once in order that capitalist domination may be destroyed, that production may be advanced to a higher point, and that reconstruction may be carried on for the advantage of all the citizens.

We demand as rapid a transformation as possible of a capitalist society into a socialist society, in order that the empire of liberty may be substituted for the empire of slavery and exploitation.

We ought not to delay the preparations for a single day. We must achieve a great task of enlightenment. For the first time, women are taking part in an election of the greatest importance and they constitute a majority of the electors. The soldiers have been drawn by the thousands from civil life. Likewise, for four years the military dictatorship has suppressed every free manifestation of opinion in the interior of the country; it has prevented the Independent Social-Democratic party in particular from spreading its doctrines.

In the short time which we still have before the date fixed for the election we must by every possible means acquaint the electors with important political facts in keeping with the principles of socialism. Not a single day must be left unused.

We must start the work of organization now. The election law has marked out the electoral districts in a most exact way and has fixed the number of candidates from each district upon the basis of a uniform regulation. Candidates should be chosen in agreement with all the local organizations of the party. In each district an independent and complete list of the members of the Independent Social-Democratic party of Germany should be made out. Special attention must be given to the fact that any workmen who enjoy the confidence of their fellow-workers may be designated as candidates.

It is not a question of electing a Parliament which shall sit for some years. We comrades, workers in factories, shops, countinghouses, stores, mines, and workers in the fields are in no way prevented from entering as representatives the National Assembly. The women who until now have worked with the men in the cause of emancipation of the working class should be chosen for the same honor as the men. In order to have proletariat socialism ably represented in the National Assembly, it is necessary to choose the most capable, whether man or woman.

The dispute over the subject of the dates upon which the Constituent Assembly should convene is now general. At the present moment, it is a question of exploiting the political situation in the interests of the working class, by means of the victory of the Independent Social-Democratic party.

Citizens, men and women, brace yourselves for the work. We must achieve and make permanent the Socialist republic!

The International Communist Congress

THE following document, transmitted by wireless from Moscow, is taken from the *France Libre* (Paris) of January 26. The text is defective in parts, and certain phrases and additions are taken from a partial version published on January 25 by *Figaro*.

The Congrees of the Communist Internationale considers it urgently necessary to convoke the first congress of the new revolutionary Internationale. During the war and the revolution [it has happened that] both the Socialist and the Social-Democratic parties are finally, completely bankrupt, and also, at the same time, the revolution is in danger of being stifled by the alliance of capitalist states, which are forming a coalition against the revolution under the hypocritical banner of the "league of peoples." The attempts of parties which are traitors to socialism to unite, after an "amnesty" shall have been granted, once more to help their Government and their bourgeoisie to deceive the working class, the extraordinary revolutionary experience already gained, and the internationalization of the whole revolutionary movement—all these motives require us to bring up for discussion the question . . . of the convocation of an international congress of the revolutionary proletarian parties.

I. Aims and Treaties.

In our opinion, the recognition of the following . . . should serve as a platform for the Internationale:

1. The present period is the period of the dissolution and ruin of the whole capitalist system of the world (the text as printed in *Figaro* adds "and the disappearance of European culture").

2. The task of the proletariat consists to-day in taking possession at once of the governmental power (the *Figaro* text inserts here "this power signifies the annihilation of the present apparatus of government") in order to replace it by the apparatus of proletarian power.

3. This new governmental apparatus should incorporate the dictatorship of the working class and, in some places, that also of the small peasants and agricultural laborers, that is to say, the instrument of the systematic overthrow of the exploiting classes.

4. The dictatorship of the proletariat should aim at the immediate appropriation of capitalism and the suppression of private property as regards the means of production which comprises under the name of socialism the suppression of private property and its transfer to the proletarian state under the Socialist administration of the working class, . . . the abolition of capitalist agricultural production, the monopolisation of the large commercial firms, of large houses. . . .

5. In order to make the Socialist revolution secure the disarming (?) of the bourgeoisie and of its agents and the general arming of the proletariat are necessary.

II. Attitude With Regard to Socialist Parties.

6. The fundamental condition of the struggle is the mass action of the proletariat going as far as open conflict with arms in hand against the governmental power of capitalism.

7. The old Internationale has split into three principal groups: the openly patriotic Socialists who during the whole imperialist war of the years 1914 to 1918 have supported their own bourgeoisie; the minority Socialists who have changed into a "centre party" whose leader at present is Kautsky, and which constitutes an organ composed of always hesitant elements incapable of a determined attitude, and who until now have really acted as traitors; lastly the revolutionary Left Wing.

8. Against the Social-patriots who everywhere, in the most critical movements, have marched against the revolution, arms in hand, only a combat without mercy is possible. As to the "Centre," the tactics consist in separating out the revolutionary elements, in a pitiless criticism of its leaders, and in systematically dividing its adherents among themselves; these tactics are absolutely necessary on arriving at a certain phase of development.

9. On the other side, it is necessary to proceed to a *bloc*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement with those elements of the revolutionary workers who, although they have not formerly belonged to the party, now adopt as a whole the point of view of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the form of Soviet power . . . the syndicalist elements of the labor movement.

10. Lastly, it is necessary to rally the groups and the proletarian organizations which, while not having joined the revolutionary current of the Left, have nevertheless shown the development of a tendency in that direction.

11. We propose that the representatives of the following parties, groups, and tendencies take part in the congress as plenipotentiary members of the labor Internationale: (1) the Spartacus League (Germany); (2) The Bolsheviks or Communist party (Russia); the communist parties of (3) German Austria; (4) Hungary; (5) Finland; (6) Poland; (7) Esthonia; (8) the Lettish provinces (9) Lithuania; (10) White Russia; and (11) the Ukraine; (12) the revolutionary elements among the Czechs; (13) the Bulgarian Social-Democratic party; (14) the Rumanian Social-Democratic party; (15) the Left Wing of the Serbian Social-Democratic party; (16) the Left of the Swedish Social-Democratic party; (17) the Norwegian Social-Democratic party; (18) in Denmark those groups standing for the class struggle; (19) the Dutch Communist party; (20) the revolutionary elements of the Belgian Labor party; (21) and (22) the groups and organizations within the Socialist and trade union (syndicalist) movement of France, which, as a whole, are solidary; (23) the Left of the Swiss Social Democratic party; (24) the Italian Socialist party; (25) the elements of the Left in the Spanish Socialist party; (26) the elements of the Left in the Portuguese Socialist party; (27) the British Socialist party (the elements in it most nearly approaching us are those represented by MacLean); (28) I. S. P. R. (England); (29) I. W. W. K. (England); (30) I. W. W. (Great Britain); (31) the revolutionary elements in the labor organizations of Ireland; (32) the revolutionary elements among the shop-stewards (Great Britain); (33) S. L. P. (America); (34) the elements of the Left of the American Socialist party (tendencies represented by Debs and by the Socialist Propaganda League); (35) American I. W. W. (Workers of the World); (36) I. W. W. (Australia); (37) American Workers International Industrial Union; (38) the Socialist groups of Tokio and of Samoa represented by Genkkayma; (39) the Young People's Socialist Internationale.

III. The Question of the Organization and Name

12. The bases of the Third Internationale consist in the fact that various elements have already formed themselves in groups and organizations of comrades of the same opinion who . . . in a definite form and who . . . the same tactical methods . . . in the other countries.

13. The Congress should be transformed into a common organ of combat with a view to the permanent struggle and the systematic direction of the movement as a centre of the Communist Internationale which will subordinate the interests of the movement in each country to the common interests of the revolution from an international point of view. The concrete forms of the organization, of representation, etc. . . . . will be elaborated by the Congress.

Contributors to This Issue

Edward S. Corwin is professor of politics in Princeton University.

M. Zippin is on the staff of the *Jewish World* (Philadelphia) and is a correspondent for organs of the Left Socialist Revolutionist party of Russia.

Edward T. Heyn was formerly American vice-consul at Reichenberg, Bohemia.

Foreign Press

Present Tendencies in Norwegian Labor

THE influence of the Soviet form of government on the programme of the working-class movement in Norway is described in the following article by Martin Tranmael, leader of the syndicalist faction which gained a majority in the Norwegian Socialist party at its national convention in 1918. The article appeared in a recent issue of *Samtiden* (Christiania) a journal of social, political, and literary opinion.

Every age, every social system creates its own forms of power. Thus the parliamentarism of our age is the true daughter of our bourgeois system. But it no longer meets the requirements of the times. New forms of organized society are being evolved. We live in a transition period. In most countries the control is still vested in the capitalists, and yet many old institutions are being undermined, and traditional forms of government are breaking down. We know, for instance, that the balance of power has been shifted from the parliaments to private banking corporations and to the 'Changes. It follows that the working class, which is now struggling with the bourgeoisie for mastery, must also use non-parliamentary means, and these have now gained a large place in our community.

The non-parliamentary or direct action presages new forms of organized society. New ideas are born and develop within the old body politic, but if they are of a revolutionary nature, they will burst the confines of the old frame and stand forth on their own ground. It is this process that is now taking place in labor circles the world over.

Working men understand that the much-vaunted bourgeois democracy, which is built on parliamentary government, is unable to solve the new problems; it may cope with political questions, but not with economic issues, which are too complicated for a parliament; nor are parliaments chosen with a view to solving these problems, and for this reason their activities often run out in nothing but talk.

Besides, it is difficult to get the masses of working men out for an election. The matters at stake are too vague; it is impossible to make them rally around great measures or principles. Even though the working men attempt to concentrate on special demands, it is of little avail, for it is to the interest of the other classes to confuse the issue, and by means of the powerful press and other methods at the disposal of our antagonists it is only too easy.

When it comes to direct action, as in a strike, it is quite another matter. Then class consciousness and solidarity are awakened. No one wants to be a scab, even though he may be one in the elections. In a strike, the working men meet with unbroken ranks. The effects may be traced deep down among the working people; not only the men—the workers—but the women are borne along on the wave. They feel themselves a part of their class and throw all the deep indignation and the tremendous influence of the home on the side of the strikers.

Hitherto strikes have concerned themselves chiefly with the special demands of certain unions; but they will develop into revolutionary and political measures. By means of the general strike every man and woman will be forced to take sides for or against labor's ideal of organized society. When not only the industrial workers and artisans but the transportation workers, the crofters, the farm laborers and small farmers, and the fishermen have been organized for class war, the position of labor will be very strong. If then the upper classes are deprived of the support they have had in the military, the chances for a successful revolution ought to be very good indeed.

Granted that the working men gain control in this manner, it is self-evident that old institutions, laws, and traditions will be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolished. A new class, a new idea, will have conquered. This means far-reaching changes in all forms of organized society.

Is it reasonable to suppose that the victorious working class would begin by calling in a new constitutional assembly after the old outworn patterns? Would not labor naturally seek its own forms of power? That is what the Russians have done and, more recently, the Germans. It is, of course, quite possible, in view of the difficult position in which the German working men are placed, that they may have to hold elections according to liberalistic principles, but this does not alter the historical fact that the revolution found its natural expression through the new social factors, workmen's and soldiers' councils. Therefore these are not a purely Russian, but an international manifestation.

The workmen's and soldiers' councils have sprung up spontaneously in Russia and also in Austria and Germany. They build on a broader basis than the old labor unions and Socialist parties. The labor unions consisted only of wage earners, and the Socialist parties built on certain party programmes. The workmen's and soldiers' councils, on the other hand, seek to unite *all* who wish to take part in the great work of making over society. During the period of revolution, they would be the common organs of all the forces of progress and reconstruction, although their basic elements would be the labor unions and the Socialist parties.

But they are something more; they are new social organs, and therein lies their chief significance. They aim to take over the administration of the country and replace the old governing bodies; the local councils would control the municipalities, the district councils the larger units, and the national council would take the place of the national parliament.

The councils would be organized as far as possible along the lines of occupations. Not only manual laborers, but all who do useful work would have the right to belong. Councils could, for instance, be established at schools and other useful institutions. The entire producing class—workers with hand and brain—would have a part in the movement. The local councils would choose representatives to the district and national conferences where issues concerning the whole country would be decided. The Government, or people's commissioners, would be elected from the national conference, which would have a direct connection with occupational organizations, that is with practical life. Thus a new democracy would be founded on social lines.

During the transition period it may be necessary to establish a dictatorship, but never a dictatorship of the minority. It is true that revolution may be effected by a determined minority, but in order to keep the ground thus gained the sanction of the majority must be won. If the council or Soviet form of government is chosen, all who belong to the productive class will be able to exert an influence on the trend of development.

Those who still persist in wanting to live on other people's labor will not be admitted to the soldiers' and peasants' councils. But all such have shut themselves out by their parasitic existence and are not to be pitied. As soon as they report for useful work, they will be allowed to join the councils and have the same rights as all others. And in that same moment, the dictatorship—if it can be so called—will be at an end. It is possible that when conditions have become normal again—that is when the process of socialization has been completed—the organization of society will be revised, but it will hardly be in the direction of a parliamentary government after the old bourgeois pattern; it is more likely to be in the direction of greater local self-government.

In the warring countries, the soldiers' councils have played a tremendously important part. They took the initiative in the social revolution and, together with the workmen's council, seized the reins of power. In neutral countries their task will not be so important, and yet we need them. In our country their chief mission is, firstly, to prevent the employment of the military against working men and, secondly, to force a disestablishment of the military power altogether. It is necessary that the ruling class should be disarmed, since the working men are unarmed. If both classes meet on equal terms, the struggle can be fought out through organization and along political lines.

That is what the working men desire.

We should prefer to do away with soldiers' councils altogether in the work or social reconstruction, but that can only be if disarmament is absolute and complete. If the bourgeoisie form white or black guards, the working men will have to take similar measures. The question of whether or not bayonets are to be used in the coming social struggle depends entirely upon our opponents. Labor is committed to the principle of disarmament.

At present we are making every effort to establish soldiers' councils in the municipalities and districts and are preparing to organize them in the camps, providing the men are called out for military training. On the other hand, the movement for workmen's councils is at present in abeyance. Last spring we formed a number to meet the situation created by the high cost of living and the labor troubles, and they certainly had a considerable influence, especially on conditions within the Socialist party. We shall need them again in case of a crisis such as a political strike or a revolution, and if the revolution is carried to a successful end, they will certainly be retained as a part of the new system.

The Norwegian working class does not intend to copy the forms employed in other countries; whatever system we adopt, it must be modified to meet local conditions. And yet there is much in the council or Soviet system to appeal to working men, and it is likely that some form of it will be chosen.

Because of that fact and because of the great part the Soviet has already played in the world revolution, it is incumbent on all persons who take an intelligent interest in social problems to understand this new creation and the principles on which it is based. Bogies and prejudices are the sign of nothing but spiritual poverty. Only arguments and realities count—no matter on which side we stand in the class war.

The League of the New Fatherland

THE following article describing the programme and work of the *Bund Neues Vaterland* was written by Romain Rolland for the *Humanité* (Paris) of January 27.

Among the Germans who fought the capitalist and military imperialism of their Government during the war the League of the New Fatherland (Bund Neues Vaterland) early made itself felt. Founded on November, 1914, in Berlin it labored zealously for the democratization of Germany and for a *rapprochement* with England and France. It had therefore to endure the rigors of the authorities. In June, 1915, its two secretaries, Lilly Jannasch and Elsbeth Bruck, were thrown into prison and soon afterward the society was dissolved by military authority. On the initiative of some of its members including Eduard Bernstein, Count Arco, Kurt von Tepper-Laski, etc., it reconstituted itself in September, 1918, when the revolution was approaching. At several meetings in October it demanded investigation of the question of responsibility for the war, abolition of the state of seige and the censorship, complete liberty of speech, press, and assembly, amnesty for all political offences, and the convocation of a national assembly elected by direct, secret, and universal suffrage with women and soldiers allowed to vote.

When the revolution broke out the *Bund Neues Vaterland* played an active part. After a meeting of the directing committee at the house of Dr. Magnus Kirschfeld, on November 8, the members were called together at an out-door meeting on Sunday, November 10, on the Reichstag Place at the foot of the Bismarck Monument. An appeal by the author, René Schickele, the well-known editor of the *Weissen Blätter* review, was posted on the walls of Berlin:

"Workers! Citizens! The present organization of society has led us to the abyss, we are in chaos. There is only one way to escape from it; let the peoples take thought and establish the reign of justice.

LIBRARY
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Socialist society alone can save them from falling into barbarism. . . We appeal to all: laborers, scholars, peasants, workingmen, students, merchants, employees, artists, men and women. . . We demand the immediate dissolution of the Reichstag and the election of a national assembly. . . A new world is to be created. All must coöperate, all who are loyal and pure-hearted, not traitors and hypocrites. A new world demands new men. Let us risk everything for the sake of a new Germany. *Rather ruin than compromise.* Through democracy to Socialism. Hurrah for the democratic Internationale of the new world. Hurrah for the Socialist democratic Republic.

For the *Bund Neues Vaterland*

Signed: KURT VON TEPPER-LASKI,
DR. HELENE STÖCKER,
DR. MAGNUS HIRSCHFELD.

To this appeal for a meeting, two to four thousand persons responded at noon on Sunday, November 10. At the foot of the statue of Bismarck, near the Brandenburg gate, Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld said that the Kaiser had hoped to make a triumphal reentry into Berlin with his troops by the Brandenburg gate, but that it was the liberated people who had yesterday made their victorious entry with the red flag of the Republic. Henceforth the motto, "The King's will is the supreme law," would be replaced by the slogan, "Everything by the people and for the people." The Socialist republic must be founded. Men of all countries unite! Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld was closing his address by hailing the free German republic when sharp machine gun fire came from a house where officers loyal to the Emperor had intrenched themselves, at the corner of the Dorotheen Strasse and Sommer Strasse. The Red Guard replied. A mad panic took possession of the crowd. A bloody assault was made on the building. Nevertheless, on the other side of the Reichstag building, before several thousand people, Dr. Magnus continued his speech to the sound of the machine guns.

On November 13 another popular meeting was called by the *Bund Neues Vaterland.* Several victims of the old régime spoke; the former embassy councillor, Baron Eckardstein, who, as a punishment for realizing and declaring the responsibility of the German Government for the war, had spent two years in prison, and the former Captain von Beerfeld, who turned pacifist on the battlefield.

"For eight months," said the last named, "I have been shut up in prisons and mad-houses. But, like myself, the German people have been delivered. Now we must kindle a torch. . . We must not doubt the strength that is hidden in the German people. It is unfortunate that we have had to learn it on the field of battle, where our best men have been sacrificed to serve criminal ends. I do not wish to say anything to arouse high feeling, but it is necessary to speak the truth. If we wish to enter upon a new epoch, we must be honest; only by the truth are we able to attain liberty. . . . I am not a politician, but my political feeling has been aroused by my compassion for my comrades, there, at the front. They have demanded criminal things of us; they have deceived the people in pretending that this was a war for defense; it has been nothing of the sort; we have attempted to carry on a war of conquest. Four months ago, while I was under arrest, I wrote a pamphlet in which I showed that the German Government had used lies and deceit. A crime has been committed against the free German people. If our leading men had only spent twenty-four hours at the front, under fire, they would quickly have made an 'about face'."

The *Bund Neues Vaterland* publishes in its November number a remarkable statement concerning its spirit and its purpose: "It is not," it states, "a political party, but a working society in the manner of the English Fabian Society." Without a definite party programme, it wishes to devote itself to the foundation of a German Socialist republic upon a democratic basis, and to the great work of reconciling the peoples. It is the enemy of any class dictatorship, of all tyranny. It wishes to work together with all Socialists who fight for the sanctity of life against that sacro-saint murderer, capital. It hails the political revolution as the powerful motive force which has broken the absolute domination of capitalism. But it has the knowledge that even democracy and Socialism are only the means and not the end. The end is the free development of each personality and its expansion upon a basis of true spiritual and moral culture. That is what we must create. That is what the *Bund Neues Vaterland* wants. The rest of its programme shows that it intends to be a veritable factory of work and to organize throughout Germany, "seminaries," societies for study and for discussion, assemblies, etc., which shall spread their ideas through the whole nation.

Among the members of its committees of guidance and of work we find the names of many eminent writers and scholars: Prof. Nicolaï; the great doctor, Albert Einstein; the director of the *Forum,* Wilhelm Herzog; the director of the *Weissen Blätter,* René Schickele; the author of the most poignant book written in German about the war, Andreas Latzko; the novelist, Heinrich Mann; the director of *Friedenswarte,* the pacifist magazine, Alfred F. Fried; Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld; Dr. Elizabeth Rotten, the founder of a splendid work of assistance to prisoners, of which I spoke in the article, "Our Neighbor, the Enemy"; Dr. Helene Stöcker; Lilli Jannasch; the Prussian Minister of Finance, Hugo Simon, etc.

Let us not forget to observe finally, apropos of this last name, that certain of the oldest and most active members of the *Bund Neues Vaterland* have been named by a revolutionary Government and the Council of Soldiers and Workmen for important posts in the new régime. Such are Kurt Eisner, Eduard Bernstein, H. von Gerlach, Count Arco, and many others.

Famine in Europe

THE Allied policy of blockade has met with vigorous objection from the Socialist groups in France and Great Britain. The following protest by Jean Longuet appeared in the *Populaire* (Paris) of January 24.

It might have been hoped that with the cessation of hostilities the food situation in Europe would at once improve and rapidly become normal. The event proves quite otherwise. The mad policy of the ruling classes aggravates further the evil which it was hoped might be cured after the armistice, and there is no longer a single country on the Continent where the situation does not appear alarming. The blockade, maintained rigorously not only against Germany and Central Europe but against Russia and all Eastern Europe, causes a tragic state of things. In Western Europe and in particular in France capitalistic speculation cynically gives itself rein. The absurd slowness with which demobilization is effected and the consequent retention under the colors of millions of idle men explain the more and more intolerable increase in the cost of living. In the North the lamentable way in which the food supply is being handled explains the scandalous situation there. So in different ways the Continent is filled with catastrophies.

At Paris the suppression of price regulation, freeing the appetite for speculation, makes us pay a franc for an egg and ten francs a pound for butter. And all the rest is in proportion.

In Germany there is no longer any doubt that the situation is terrible. The *Manchester Guardian* announces that the blockade there is enforced more vigorously than before the armistice. Mr. Henry Nevinson, an eminent journalist, has published in the *Daily News* a tragic description of what he found in the hospitals of Cologne: "Although I have seen many horrible things in the world," he writes, "I have seen nothing so pitiful as these rows of babies feverish from want of food, exhausted by privation to the point that their little limbs were like slender wands, their expression hopeless, and their faces full of pain."

Mr. Hoover, the great food controller, sent there by President Wilson, declares that the blockade must be lifted if Germany is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be properly provisioned. On the other hand a moving appeal has been made for rubber nipples, thousands of babies having already died for lack of this indispensable adjunct of babies' bottles. So, with a fine generosity, English women, instead of responding in the cannibal language of our exterminationist journalists, have sent the needed articles to the anxious German mothers. Nevertheless the food situation remains very serious. The *Herald* of London says it is desperate.

There is no doubt that the situation in Austria is much worse, and that in Serbia and above all in Russia is more terrible yet.

Our sycophants and trouble-makers, especially the base informers of the "Legue Civique" (who, be it said by the way, have thought it well to resume on their own account the vile campaigns of the sinister Lysis-Letailleur) have pretended great indignation over the exclamation, "It is abominable!" with which the other day in the Chamber I met the announcement of the famous "sanitary cordon" twisted about the neck of Russia by Messrs. Pichon and Clemenceau.

As a matter of fact there is no other way to describe the policy which, according to the calculations of the Anglo-American press, threatens soon to cause the death by starvation of ten million men, women, and children out of about seventy million in Northern Russia. This fine anti-Bolshevist strategy has especially caused suffering from hunger among the bourgeois elements of Russia, naturally the least favored by the Government of workers and peasants. But it is not only Eastern and Central Europe which suffer from this insane policy of our imperialist Governments. Western Europe itself has to bear its disastrous and fatal consequences. The blockade policy arrests the natural process of exchange across all Europe, it is calculated that there is now an excess of twenty million tons of wheat which might be exported but are not. Famine produces Bolshevism, certain newspapers declare. Our English friends of the *Herald*, commenting on this, very justly remark that "we do not know very well what most papers understand by Bolshevism for they do not know very well themselves. But if this reasoning is sound then the blockade policy is pure madness even from the point of view of our bourgeois preservers."

A German Protest from Alsace-Lorraine

SINCE the signing of the armistice German papers have contained frequent discussions of the treatment of German inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine at the hands of the French. The following protest to President Wilson dated at Freiburg on January 13, is taken from the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of January 14.

Those who up to the present time have been full citizens of Alsace-Lorraine—native residents of German origin to whom this land unquestionably owes a great part of its fruitfulness—turn in deep distress to the leader of the free American people pleading for protection against the oppressive rule of French despotism under which more than 400,000 people are suffering. While the Americans and the British respect the rights of the people, old men, women, and children in occupied territories, the citizens of German descent in Strassburg, Kohman, Muelhausen, and other places, are treated most cruelly by the French, publicly herded together in sight of French officers, roughly handled and jeered at by street mobs, and often taken across the border like cattle in open automobiles. Only the barest necessities, from forty to sixty pounds of luggage are allowed a family. House furnishings and all other personal property are forcibly retained, often squandered or wantonly destroyed, preventing further usefulness. Relying on your broad-spirited peace plans, Mr. President, and on the explicit reassurances of the interim Government, these people remained in their homes after the armistice. Should you not, Mr. President, bring immediate relief, an irreparable state of distress will be established; the memory of these regulations will never be lost by the German people, and your intention to create a league of nations will forever be made futile. The undersigned committee of exiles assembled in Freiburg, Baden, in desperate state, under barely life-sustaining conditions, beg you in deepest need, to take steps to put an end to these measures, and see that their private property at least is returned to the outcasts.

Sport and Politics in Ireland

AN interesting conflict between sport and politics is revealed by various recent articles in the Irish press. The following account of the difficulty in conducting a hunt in a time of political unrest is taken from the *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin) of February 6.

Hunting was resumed with the Westmeath Hounds yesterday, after a fortnight's suspension, due to Sinn Fein opposition. The meet was at Bunbrusna, and over sixty people, including many farmers, rode to hounds.

While the first covert was being drawn at Ballinacloon, about ten Sinn Feiners approached the Master (Mr. E. W. Hope-Johnstone) and three spokesmen protested against hunting until the prisoners were released.

Mr. Hope-Johnstone replied that he had no politics, and that every Sinn Feiner or person of any other political opinions who wished to hunt with the hounds was welcome to do so. He added that during the season he had spent £4,000 out of his own pocket in keeping up the hunt. He would not do so in the future if he were now to be stopped, and the fifteen men employed at the kennels would have to be dismissed. . . . The Sinn Feiners asked certain farmers not to follow the hunt, but the appeal was not successful.

At this point a fox was viewed away, and the field started in pursuit. The fox got to ground at Clonheigh, and Donore was then drawn blank, but from the Knock of Twyfarnham a fox gave a capital run, and shortly afterwards a good day's sport ended.

Except for the initial protest there was no interference with the hunt. . . . "We were made welcome everywhere," said one old sportsman. Other meets were on the fixture card.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandivanian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

THE Swedish Parliament on December 18 adopted, with the concurrence of all the parties except the Socialists of the extreme Left, a draft of Constitutional reforms prepared by a special Parliamentary commission. Under the present system Sweden has had a Lower House democratically elected and an Upper House elected by provincial assemblies, themselves chosen on a property basis. Payers of direct taxes, men or women, have the right to cast from one to forty votes for these assemblies according to taxable income. Corporations as well as individuals have votes, and plural voting is allowed. The two chambers of Parliament are constitutionally equal; assent of both is necessary to legislation and all questions come up simultaneously for discussion in both houses. Budgetary questions are finally decided by a majority vote, both houses voting together. The new system, introducing democratic methods, will probably result in a large increase of liberal and radical members in both Houses. In local, provincial, and Parliamentary elections alike it provides for universal suffrage for men and women twenty-three years of age and over without regard to taxes paid, and abolishes plural voting and the votes of corporations. The Upper House is still to be chosen by the provincial assemblies, but these are henceforth themselves to rest on a democratic basis. The electorate of the Lower House is increased not only by the enfranchisement of women but by an addition of about twenty per cent. to the present electorate in the shape of persons now excluded as receiving poor relief or on account of unpaid taxes.

A DETAILED scheme of organization for a league of nations, recently drawn up under the direction of the German Society for International Law, was published in part in the London *Times* of February 3. The "fundamental principles" of the league according to the German plan are as follows: (1) The league of nations is intended to secure a lasting peace, based upon the moral power of right and the independence and inviolability of all states, and to promote the welfare of the peoples by common work. (2) Separate political alliances and secret treaties are forbidden. (3) State agreements of every kind are to be communicated immediately to the Permanent Committee of the League of Nations, which will publish them in its official organ. (4) Declarations of war can be made only with consent of the Parliaments. States belonging to the league of nations which do not yet possess a provision to this effect in their Constitutions are obliged to make the provision immediately.

THE formation of a new political party in Italy—the Italian Popular party—announced on January 19, marks a departure from political traditions. The new party is definitely Catholic in membership and purpose although its programme is designed to appeal to "all men who are morally free and socially developed, to all who appreciate and respect the moral virtues of our people." "Perhaps," suggests the Rome correspondent of the London *Times*, "it would be going too far to say that the programme is free from clericalism, for its first article implies definite opposition to divorce, but the rest of the programme is entirely modern." A letter to the Pope from Count Della Torre, president of the Unione Popolare, a Catholic organization under the direction of the Vatican, states that the activities of the Unione will cease and be transferred to the Popular party. This is the first time an avowedly Catholic party has been formed in Italy and the understanding is that it will not be directly controlled by the Vatican but will be a free Catholic organization.

THE appointment of a Spanish commission to decide upon the participation of Spain in the league of nations was announced in a recent decree signed by King Alfonso. The commission was to be composed of seven members nominated by the Foreign Minister and seven chosen by the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Science, the General Commission of Codification, the Central General Staff of the Navy, the Junta of Tariffs and Valuations, the Superior Council of Works, and the Royal Academy of Jurisprudence and Legislation. The chief of the political section of the Foreign Office was designated as general secretary of the commission with power to speak and vote.

THE new Irish Centre party, formed by the amalgamation of the Irish Federalist party and the Constitutional Progressive party, has issued a programme recently republished in the *Christian Science Monitor*. By open and constitutional means the party seeks to secure self-government for Ireland within the Empire, under a central Parliament for the whole of Ireland dealing with national affairs; provincial self-government under provincial assemblies, dealing with provincial affairs; a national policy of reconstruction to develop all the national resources of Ireland; a national system of primary and secondary education adequately financed from the Irish Exchequer and controlled on lines which allow free development alike for the Catholic and Protestant ideals of teaching; clean and effective administration throughout the country and admission to all branches of the public service by competitive examination regulated by a Civil Service Commission as recommended by the Irish Convention; the completion of land purchase on the plan recommended by the Irish Convention; and drastic reform of the control of public health of the poor law system, and of the conditions of labor, including the immediate provision of suitable and sufficient housing for the working classes.

THE first conference of the new Moderate party in India, held in opposition to the various congresses of "extremists," adopted resolutions approving and supporting the reform proposals of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State. Certain extensions of the scheme, such as application of the principle of responsible government to the central as well as the provincial Governments and a gradual increase in the power of the Indian Legislature are suggested, as well as a change in the composition of the Council of State "to insure that one-half of its total strength shall consist of elected members." The resolutions urge that no limitations of civil liberties be effected without the consent of the legislative assembly "except in a time of war or internal disturbance." The conference also recommends that the Indian element in the executive Government of India be one-half of the total number of members of the Government, which, acting under the control of the Legislature, "should enjoy the same power of regulating the fiscal policy of India as the Governments of the self-governing Dominions enjoy in regulating their fiscal policy."

MEANWHILE, according to recent reports in the British and Indian press, the Indian "extremists" have been active. The moderate daily paper of Allahabad, the *Leader*, stated that the reputation of the Indian Nation Congress for practical statesmanship and sobriety of judgment "was torn to pieces at its Delhi session by a section of the Extremist party, which was able to dominate its deliberations." According to a report in the London *Times* of February 5 "a pseudo-democratic appearance" was given to the Congress by the presence of several hundred peasants, who, "knowing no language but their own vernaculars, were quite unable to follow the proceedings." The main resolution on the Montagu-Chelmsford reform proposals demands that in the provinces "full responsible government should be granted at once, and that no part of British India should be excluded from the benefit of the proposed constitutional reforms." Another resolution demanded the immediate repeal of all laws, regulations, and ordinances in respect to seditious utterances and writings which confer powers of arrest and detention on the Executive "outside the processes of ordinary civil or criminal law." The immediate liberation of all *detenues* and of all political prisoners was claimed as an act of amnesty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED